

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

2352

# The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.  
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

## Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.*

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

E. HARRISON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,  
LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.  
R. C. SEATON, M.A.

*With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.*

H. RICHARDS, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*  
Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D.,  
F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXIX

FEBRUARY, 1915

No. I

## CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
Notes on Some Inscriptions from Asia Minor. MARCUS N. TOD .. ..	1	Sturtevant's <i>Studies in Greek Noun-Formation: Labial Terminations III. and IV.</i> G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ .. ..	24
Demosthenes, <i>περὶ τῶν Συμμοριῶν</i> . J. R. WARDALE .. ..	5	Bezard's <i>Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils</i> . R. B. APPLETON .. ..	25
Note on the Parallelism between the <i>Prometheus Vinculus</i> of Aeschylus and the <i>Antigone</i> of Sophocles. C. R. HAINES ..	8	A New Edition of Firmicus. H. W. GARROD ..	27
Varia. H. RICHARDS .. ..	10	SHORT NOTICES:	
The Influence of the Interjection on the Development of the Sentence. FRANK GRANGER .. ..	12	<i>A Selection of Latin Verse</i> . Σ. .. ..	28
NOTES:		Way's <i>Sophocles in English Verse. Part II.: Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes</i> . A. S. OWEN .. ..	28
Theocritus, <i>Idyll</i> XV. 112. R. J. SHACKLE ..	18	Harmon's <i>Lucian</i> . A. S. OWEN .. ..	29
Terence, <i>Eunuchus</i> , 835-839. J. S. PHILLIMORE .. ..	18	<i>Papyri Iandanas</i> . A. S. H. .. ..	29
Horace, <i>Epistles</i> , II. i. 113-117. J. S. PHILLIMORE .. ..	19	<i>Two Elementary Latin Grammars</i> . W. E. P. PANTIN .. ..	30
REVIEWS:		Herbig, <i>Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen</i> . W. M. LINDSAY .. ..	30
Thomson's <i>Studies in the Odyssey</i> . A. SHEWAN .. ..	20	Asmus, <i>Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos</i> . R. G. B. ..	31
Misson's <i>Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios</i> . WILMER CAVE WRIGHT ..	22	Heisenberg, <i>Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt</i> . M. P. .. ..	31
Petersen, <i>The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ιακη</i> . G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ .. ..	23	CORRESPONDENCE .. ..	32
		BOOKS RECEIVED .. ..	32

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of the Year's Work in Classical Studies (both post free). They may also obtain the CLASSICAL REVIEW and CLASSICAL QUARTERLY at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 12s. 6d. for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London, W.C., and Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss R. H. Rees, B.A., Ladybarn House, Withington, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, 66, Canning Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; Miss Tildesley, Redland High School, Bristol; and Mr. R. H. Soltau, The University, Bristol; Mr. O. R. A. Byrde, Royal Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.

---

## THE HISTORIES OF TACITUS

A TRANSLATION FOR ENGLISH READERS

BY GEORGE GILBERT RAMSAY, M.A. Oxon., LL.D, Litt.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

*With Introduction, Notes and Maps. Demy 8vo. 15s. net [Ready Shortly]*

This volume is in continuation of the previously-published "Translations of Tacitus" by the same author. It is on the same scale, and in the same form as the previous volumes.

The object of the Translator is to present the English reader with a version of Tacitus which shall be strictly faithful to the original, and yet not read as a translation; which shall give some idea of the characteristic qualities of the great Roman historian, and yet be expressed in such idiomatic English as might be employed by a writer of the twentieth century.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

---

## WHERE TO BUY YOUR BOOKS

### JUST ISSUED

### A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS RELATING TO NAPOLEON I.

Messrs. HATCHARD request the honour of a visit to inspect their extensive Collection of Second-hand and Rare Books.

HATCHARDS  
187, PICCADILLY, LONDON, W.

### BOOKS

### FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND

CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

### J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C.

nd  
on  
al  
to  
te

al  
s;  
,  
).  
e  
e  
n  
l.  
or

n.  
l.  
ct  
;  
d,  
y  
l.  
l,  
;  
.  
s

y  
e  
ll  
e  
s





# The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1915

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### NOTES ON SOME INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR.

#### I.—Πατρομύστης.

THE latest fascicule of the invaluable collection of *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes* includes, together with a number of other texts from Smyrna, one (*I.G.R.* iv. 1393) which was published by Spon and by Muratori, and afterwards by Boeckh (*C.I.G.* 3173). It is a dedication to the Emperor Titus and his brother Domitian, attributed by Cagnat 'anno 80 post C.n.' The date can, however, be determined somewhat more exactly, since Titus is described as *δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ θ'* (*trib. pot.* ix.), and his ninth year of *tribunicia potestas* expired on June 30, 80 A.D. If, further, we suppose that Titus and Domitian were actually holding their eighth and seventh consulships respectively when the inscription was engraved, we must attribute it to one of the first four months of the year, since they were succeeded as consuls by L. Aelius Plautius Lamia Aelianus and C. Marius Marcellus Octavius Publius Cluvius Rufus certainly by June 13 (*C.I.L.* iii. p. 854) and probably on May 1.<sup>1</sup> After recording the names of the hereditary priest, the *stephanephoros*, the *agonothetes*, the *xystarches*, and the *διοικῶν*, the inscription proceeds (*a. l.* 14 ff.):

οἱ πε||πληρωκότες τὰ ἰσηλύσια | Σουλ-  
πίκιος Φῆρμος, | Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀρτεμᾶ?

<sup>1</sup> Weynand *ap.* Pauly-Wissowa *R.E.* vi. 2719; Liebenam, *Fastī Consulares*, 16.

πατρομύστης, | Ἀπολλώνιος Εὐδήμο[ν]?  
πατρομύστης, | Τρόφιμος Ἀσκληπιάδου,||  
Τύραννος Παπίου τοῦ Μενάνδρου.

The inscription relates to the Guild, known to us from a number of epigraphical records, of which the full title seems to have been ἡ ἱερὰ σύνοδος τῶν περὶ τὸν Βρεισέα Διόνυσον τεχνειτῶν καὶ μυστῶν (*C.I.G.* 3190); of the nature of the god and the position of his sanctuary I need not speak, since the question has been recently discussed by Mrs. Hasluck (*B.S.A.* xix. 89 ff.). Several points, however, in the lines just quoted call for comment. In ll. 17, 18 Cagnat follows Boeckh in altering the Ἀρτεμᾶς and Εὐδήμος of the stone into Ἀρτεμᾶ and Εὐδήμο[ν] respectively, regarding them as patronymics. Now it is true that patronymics occur in *a* ll. 19, 20 and perhaps in *b* l. 5 of this inscription; but it is equally true that they are absent in seven cases and their presence is thus exceptional rather than normal. Moreover, the primary rule of epigraphy is not to assume that the engraver has erred save when forced to do so, and here there is no such necessity; for the possession of two names by the same individual is a common phenomenon in the Imperial period,<sup>2</sup> and though they are frequently united by ὁ καὶ, ὁ καλούμενος or some other phrase, this is by no means invariably

<sup>2</sup> See, *e.g.*, M. Lambertz in *Glotta*, 1913, 99 ff.

so. The inscriptions of Aphrodisias, for example, supply abundant evidence<sup>1</sup> as well as those of Pergamum,<sup>2</sup> while a further proof, if one be needed, of the same fact is furnished by the very inscription under discussion, where the name of the xystarches is given in *b l. 7* as Διονύσιος Κικίνος νεώτερος).

The elaborate explanation of the phrase οἱ πεπληρωκότες τὰ (εἰ)σηλύσια given by Boeckh need not be repeated or discussed: εἰσηλύσιον is the regular term used in Imperial times for the entrance-fee charged by a society or guild, such as the Attic Iobacchi (*S.I.G.* 737), and the Pergamene ὑμνοδοί (*I.G.R.* iv. 353, *d* 13) and πρεσβύτεροι (*Ath. Mitt.* xxxii. 294, No. 18). The inscription, then, serves to record the fact that the five dedicators had duly paid their admission-fees. The first part of Cagnat's note, 'qui pecuniam debitam contulerunt cum in collegium admissi sunt, aut debitam ab aliis sua expleverunt,' is justified; for the second, however, there is no ground save an interpretation of the term πατρομύστης, according to which the patromystae are the leading members of the guild and therefore cannot have entered its membership quite recently.

Following Boeckh, Cagnat translates the term, which occurs elsewhere only in *C.I.G.* 3195, by 'mysta princeps, pater mystarum,' making it an honorary title.<sup>3</sup> But it may be regarded as certain that the word, with which the cognate title πατρογέρων may be compared, denotes a hereditary member of the guild, one whose father is, or has been, a member. It was a common practice among the Greek societies to recruit their members as far as possible from the sons of those already admitted, and frequently these were charged a lower entrance-fee or sometimes none at all: hence arises the importance of noting in a list such as the present those who enjoyed this privilege.<sup>4</sup>

One question remains, which the editors have not discussed. What is the relation of the Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος, whose name occurs first among the newly-admitted members of the guild, to the Λ. Σουλπίκιος Φίρμος who is regarded as its financial manager (διοικητής)?<sup>5</sup> Presumably not that of father and son, or the son would also be described as πατρομύστης. I am inclined to think that both names refer to the same person. The guild, it may be, required a manager and, having no one suitable among its existing members, it elected someone to hold the office in question; thus Firmus would stand last among the officials and first (taking precedence even of the two patromystae) on the list of new members. Another solution is to my mind more probable: in inscription *b* the list of officers comprises, in addition to the eponymous stephanephoros of the state, only the agonothetes and the xystarches; possibly therefore the phrase διοικούντος Λ. Σουλπίκιου Φίρμου does not point to the tenure of a regular office but to the responsibility undertaken by Firmus, as first on the list of newly enrolled members, for the erection of this monument. True, the words commonly used in this connection are ἐπιμελούμαι, ἐπιμελητέω, προνοοῦμαι, etc., or simply διὰ with the genitive,<sup>6</sup> but the use of διοικέω in this sense does not appear to me impossible.

## II.—Πρεσβύτερος.

In the inscription already discussed two names (*b ll.* 6, 7) are qualified by the addition of νεώτερος, equivalent to our 'junior.' This involves the existence of a correlative term for 'senior,' which can hardly be any other than πρεσβύτερος. In Athens the use of these terms in the Imperial period is very common,<sup>7</sup> in Laconia νεώτερος is used in this way (*I. G.* v. 1. 40, 41, [43], 69) and possibly also πρεσβύτερος,<sup>8</sup> in

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.G.* 2748 Εὐμαχος Διογένης, 2768 τὸν δεῖνα Ζηνᾶν, 2772 Μύωνα Μένανδρον, 2842 Φιλόξενος Πάνθηρ, etc.

<sup>2</sup> *I.G.R.* iv. 374, 384, 420, 497, etc.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. such titles as πατήρ πόλεως, υἱὸς πόλεως, etc.

<sup>4</sup> For the whole subject see F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, 298 ff.

<sup>5</sup> F. Poland, *op. cit.* 378.

<sup>6</sup> Larfeld, *Griech. Epigraphik*<sup>2</sup>, 446 f.

<sup>7</sup> *I.G.* iii. 1017, 1020, 1023, 1029, 1031-2, 1306, etc.

<sup>8</sup> In *I.G.* v. 1. 1280, however, πρεσβυτέρα may represent the feminine form of the honorary title πρέσβυς τοῦ ἔθνους found in the same inscription.

Thessaly ὁ πρεσβύτερος and ὁ νεώτερος seem usual, though the article is sometimes omitted,<sup>1</sup> while in the west πρεσβύτερος and νεώτερος occur side by side in a Neapolitan text (*I.G.* xiv. 717, cf. 758), and the former is found also at Rome (1084) and at St. Gilles-sur-Rhône (2444). Examples from Asia Minor are rare, partly perhaps because the use of the term πρεσβύτερος in connection with the gymnasia and with many of the guilds and societies of the Graeco-Roman world,<sup>2</sup> and above all in the terminology of the Christian Church, made it less suitable for the purpose of distinguishing a father from his son who bore the same name. Yet the Attic usage was not unknown in the east. Besides the example from Smyrna already quoted we meet with a Π. Αἰ[λίος] Ἀπο[λλώνιος] νεώτερος at Magnesia ad Sipylum (*I.G.R.* iv. 1342) and at Artanada (*Dulgerler*) in Cilicia with Παππᾶς Ὁδᾶς πρεσβύτερος,<sup>3</sup> probably not a Christian presbyter, while at Adada (*Kara Baulo*) in Pisidia two inscriptions<sup>4</sup> refer to a Βιάνωρ Ἀντιόχου πρεσβύτερος, whose pagan beliefs are attested by his tenure of the office of ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν. This gives us, I think, a key to the difficulty presented by a memorial inscription of Antioch in Pisidia (*J.R.S.* ii. 97, No. 26) set up by a certain [Αἰλῖος] Κασ[σιανός] [πρε]σβ[ύτερος]. The editor, Professor W. M. Calder, concludes that the inscription is Christian and adds, 'but the open use of πρεσβύτερος on an epitaph in a centre of persecution like Antioch would be very unlikely before A.D. 323, and the inscription has the appearance of being earlier than this date.' If we give to πρεσβ[ύτερος] the meaning 'senior,' the difficulty disappears, and the necessity is removed of dating the inscription in the fourth century of our era, from which Professor Calder rightly recoils.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *I.G.* ix. 2. 15, 19, 21, 29, 531, 1165, etc.

<sup>2</sup> F. Poland, *op. cit.*, Index, s.v.

<sup>3</sup> J. R. S. Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition*, 89.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, 403, 412.

<sup>5</sup> Νεώτερος occurs also in Dittenb. *O.G.I.* 527, νέος is used in the same way *ibid.* 487. The restoration τοῦ νεώτερου in *C.I.G.* 2706 is quite uncertain, while the restoration Λέοντα τῶν νεώτερον in *C.I.G.* 2720, even if correct, is irrelevant to the present question.

### III.—'Επιτυχάνων.

Occasionally a difficulty is caused in the interpretation of inscriptions by the fact that many personal names are identical in form with common nouns, adjectives, or participles. Two examples, both involving the same mistake, have recently come to my notice in inscriptions from Asia Minor. In the *Revue Epigraphique* ii. 38 M. A. J. Reinach publishes a dedication found near Kizil-Kewi in the Troad, which runs—

Ἀπόλλωνι Σμινθεῖ Φλάουιοι Φιλούμενος  
καὶ Ἀγαθόπους ὁ καὶ Βούρδων ἐκ  
διαθήκης Τ. Φλαοίου ἐπιτυχάνοντος.

The dedicator set up this acknowledgment, the editor tells us in his paraphrase, 'après un succès qu'il attribuait sans doute au dieu.' That ἐπιτυχάνω can bear the meaning 'I am successful' is beyond doubt: it is used in this sense, for example, in the phrase ὁ καὶ ἐπέτυχον of *I.G.* v. i. 1146, l. 29, and in the participle ἐπιτυχόντα in *I.G.R.* iv. 791, 914, 1251.<sup>6</sup> Further, a participle is frequently found in a votive inscription to denote the occasion or cause of the dedication, as in *I.G.* v. i. 1363 [Εὐ]νομία Διὶ τυχῶσα. Yet I am convinced that we must read Ἐπιτυχάνοντος in the inscription under discussion, since (i.) a cognomen is wanted to complete the praenomen and nomen Τ. Φλαοίου, (ii.) 'après un succès' would be represented by ἐπιτυχόντος, not by ἐπιτυχάνοντος, (iii.) 'in the hour of success' (which ἐπιτυχάνοντος must denote) cannot be meant, since this is a monument erected after the dedicator's death in conformity with his testament, and (iv.) Ἐπιτυχάνων' (which has a feminine form Ἐπιτυχάνουσα and variants Ἐπιτύχανος and Ἐπιτυχανίων) is a common name throughout the Greek world in the Imperial period.

In a sepulchral inscription of Cyzicus (*I.G.R.* iv. 170), again, we need have no hesitation in restoring the proper name in place of the participle in the phrase ἐξέστω δὲ τῷ ἀπελευθέρῳ μου τεθῆναι Ἐπιτυχάνοντι ἰς τὰ ὑπὸ τὴν σορόν.

<sup>6</sup> See also T. Saucius, *Andros*, 141, No. 9.

A further example of the same source of misunderstanding may be mentioned here, as it occurs in the same volume as the last. A Samian honorary inscription of about 40 A.D. (*I.G.R.* iv. 981) opens with the words—

Ἡγεμονέα Λεωνίδου τοῦ ἡγεμονέως Καλλισθένην [ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν.

Ἡγεμονεύς is a well-attested by-form of ἡγεμών: Liddell and Scott give references to Oppian, Musaeus, and the *Palatine Anthology*, and we may add a Spartan epigram of the late second or early third century after Christ (*I.G.* v. i. 540), which begins—

Τὸν κλυτὸν ἡγεμονῆα Χαρεΐσιον ἄνθετο  
κούρα

Σπάρτας ἃ πρώτα, Πηνελόπεια νέα.

Yet in the Samian inscription Ἡγεμονέα and Ἡγεμονέως must be regarded as personal names, for (i.) the order of the words demands it, (ii.) ἡγεμονεύς is a purely poetical term, and (iii.) if it denoted a title or office it would be preceded by the definite article. We thus get in Ἡγεμονέα Καλλισθένην a further example of the possession of a double name which has been discussed above, while the insertion of the patronymics between the first and the second name is normal rather than exceptional.

#### IV.—Φιλόπατρις.

An error of the opposite kind has, I think, crept into one or two texts. An honorary inscription of Eumenia published in *C.I.G.* 3887 begins—

ὁ δῆμος Ἐπίγονον Μενεκράτους φιλόπατριν.

In Ramsay (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 377, No. 199) Φιλόπατρις becomes a second name of Epigonus, and this version is followed in *I.G.R.* iv. 741. I cannot but believe that we have here the honorary title φιλόπατρις, which is exceedingly common in the Imperial period, often in conjunction with similar titles such as φιλόκαισαρ, φιλωρῶμαιος, φιλοσεβαστος, etc., and if it be objected that on a coin of the Augustan age Epigonus Philopatris is named,<sup>1</sup> we must remember that coins

frequently bear the titles of those mentioned upon them, even where they are of a purely honorary character, such as υἱὸς πόλεως.<sup>2</sup>

I would go further and strike out Philopatris as a personal name from *C.I.G.* 4411, an honorary inscription of Iotapa in Cilicia: there too it seems to me that there is no warrant for regarding it as such and no obstacle in the way of treating it as a title.

#### V.—Imperial Titles.

The value of Imperial titles as determining the dates of inscriptions is illustrated by the dedication from Smyrna from which these notes started. Occasionally, however, it is overlooked, as, for example, in two inscriptions of Thyssanus in the Rhodian Peraea recently published by Messrs. M. and N. Chaviaras (*Arch. Ἐφημ.* 1911, 62 f., Nos. 52 γ, 54). The first of these, attributed by the editors to the years 193-211 A.D., is in honour of Julia Domna and Septimius Severus, and the titles (Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστον . . . δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ ιη', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ ιβ', ὑπάτον τὸ γ') borne by the latter prove that the inscription was engraved in 210 A.D., between the bestowal of the title Britannicus Maximus and December 10, when the Emperor entered his nineteenth term of *tribunicia potestas*.<sup>3</sup>

The second, which is in honour of Caracalla, entitles the Emperor Βρεταννικὸν μέγιστον, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας] τὸ ιγ', αὐτοκράτορα τὸ β', ὑπ[ατον τὸ (ll. 3, 4). This inscription also, then, must be dated between the grant of the title Britannicus Maximus in 210 and December 10 of that year, when Caracalla began his fourteenth tenure of *tribunicia potestas*. Moreover since he held his third consulship in 208 and his fourth in 213, we are justified in restoring ὑπ[ατον τὸ γ'] in l. 4.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*<sup>2</sup>, Index V.

<sup>3</sup> Liebenam, *Fasti Consulares*, 109 f. By a slip Liebenam writes that Severus' trib. pot. xxiii = 10th Dec. 210—4th Feb. 211: for xxiii we must read xix.

<sup>1</sup> Babelon, *Invent. de la coll. Waddington*, No. 6027.



## DEMOSTHENES ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΜΜΟΡΙΩΝ.

In this important speech, delivered in 354 B.C. at the close of the Social War, when trouble with Persia was impending, there occur several difficulties which have not yet, I think, received sufficient attention. I propose in this paper to offer such suggestions as I can towards their solution.

In the Archonship of Nausinicus (378-7 B.C.) the Symmory system had been introduced for the purpose of raising the special war tax known as *εἰσφορά*. In 357-6 B.C., by decree of Periander, this system was applied in a measure also to the trierarchy; under Periander's system the 1,200 richest citizens (*διακοσίους καὶ χιλίους συντελεῖς* Dem. in *Midiam*, § 155) were formed into twenty symmories (Dem. *de Symm.*, § 17) for the purpose of defraying jointly the expense of keeping the ships of the fleet in serviceable condition. The system had, therefore, been in operation for three years, and its defects had now become apparent. To one of these, which Demosthenes evidently regards as serious, allusion is made in § 16. We learn that, owing to various exemptions, the number of persons upon the roll was liable to fall considerably below 1,200, and to remedy this the orator proposes to raise the number to 2,000, so as to insure that there shall always be *χίλια καὶ διακόσια σώματα*. It is manifest that there was some special object in fixing the number at 1,200; the clue appears to be furnished by the following passages. From Isaeus, vii., § 38 (*de Apollodori Hered.*) we learn that no one could be called upon to serve as trierarch oftener than once in *three* years (*δυσὶ ἔτη διαλειπών*), and Xenophon (*de Rep. Ath.* 3, § 4) tells us that *four* hundred trierarchs were appointed annually—*τριήραρχοι καθίστανται τετρακόσιοι ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ*.  $3 \times 400$  gives us the number in question—1,200.

The object of Periander's system, then, was (as I suppose) to distribute the obligation equally among the wealthy citizens of Athens by an annual charge upon all alike who were liable to it, thus avoiding the clumsy process of *ἀντιδοσις* and the inequality which would

obviously be caused if one man were called upon to serve as trierarch in time of peace and another in time of war.

Even under his system, as we may gather from Demosthenes' criticism here and elsewhere, the burden often fell unequally, but into the details of the scheme by which Demosthenes further sought to equalise it—by the organisation of subsections of twelve members each with collective wealth of approximately the same amount, and by regulations for allocating ships of different classes equally to each subsection—we need not enter.

In § 19 we meet with another difficulty. If the 1,200 richest citizens were personally responsible for the expense of the trierarchy, why does Demosthenes propose to allocate to them *τὸ τίμημα τῆς χώρας*—the assessment of property for the purpose of the *εἰσφορά*? To this tax all citizens, who possessed as much as twenty-five minae, were liable and—perhaps from the first introduction in 378 B.C. at any rate for some time before 364 B.C. when Isaeus' sixth speech was delivered—the 300 richest men formed the first class. The tax was collected by the state for some years, but in 362 B.C. we read for the first time of a *προεἰσφορά* (Demosthenes, 50, § 8), the senate being requested to draw up a list of citizens required to advance the tax on behalf of their fellow-demesmen. At a later date (Demosthenes (?), 42, § 25) the 300 richest citizens (*viz.*, the first class) advanced it on behalf of all the tax-payers, irrespective of their parishes. It seems highly probable, then, that the orator is here proposing that, in lieu of any such arrangement as that of 362 B.C., the same 1,200 persons should be responsible both for the trierarchy and the advance of *εἰσφορά*. The cost of pay for the crews naturally being defrayed with other expenses from the money raised by the tax, it would obviously be a great convenience to put both of these matters in the same hands, and public attention had doubtless been directed to the unsatisfactory character of the existing arrangements



by the threat of war with Persia which was due to the aid which Chares (presumably from want of money to pay his men), had recently lent to Pharnabazus, the satrap in revolt against the great King.

I may perhaps here make a short digression, and urge some reasons for adhering to Boeckh's theory upon the term *τίμημα*.

The meaning of the term *τίμημα* has been much disputed; see Gilbert's *Greek Constitutional Antiquities* (Engl. transl., pp. 366 and following). Boeckh (*Public Economy of Athens*, pp. 515-519, Engl. transl.) maintained that the term denoted the proportion of property taxable, which was, by a graduated system,  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the case of the wealthiest class,  $\frac{1}{3}$  in the next class,  $\frac{1}{4}$  in the third class, and  $\frac{1}{5}$  in the poorest class of all. This view appears substantially correct; at any rate it squares with what Demosthenes tells us (c. *Aphobum* I, § 9)—*πεντεκαίδεκα ταλάντων γὰρ τρία τάλαντα τίμημα. ταύτην ἡξίουσιν εἰσφέρειν τὴν εἰσφορὰν*—and does not appear to be inconsistent with the language of Polybius (2. 62 § 7), although at first sight it might be thought that he regards the *τίμημα* as equivalent to the whole value. Upon this supposition the total wealth of Athens must have been about 40,000 or 45,000 talents, for the average rate of taxation would have been upon about  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the property, and the *τίμημα τῆς χώρας* is estimated here at 6,000 talents, by Philochorus (fragment 151) at 6,000, and by Polybius 2. 62 § 7 at 5,750 in the time of Nausinicus.

It has been objected that this sum—about 9 millions sterling—is inconceivably large, and various attempts have been made to explain the term *τίμημα* otherwise. Thus Beloch holds that 5,750 talents (the sum mentioned by Polybius) represented the total assessed wealth of Athens in 378 B.C., and as some property always escapes assessment, he thinks that the total wealth of Athens then was about 7,000 talents, a sum at which he arrives by elaborate calculations of the value of land, houses, slaves, etc., in Attica. It does not, however, on this assumption, seem easy to explain the clear statement of Demosthenes above cited *πεντεκαίδεκα*

*ταλάντων τρία τίμημα*, and the lease which Beloch cites (*C.I.A.* 2. 1058) may, I think, be satisfactorily explained upon Boeckh's hypothesis.

The lease stipulates that the tenant shall pay 54 drachmae by way of rent and *εἰσφορά* (if levied) *κατὰ τὸ τίμημα καθ' ἑπτά μνᾶς*: this Beloch understands to mean that the *τίμημα* was practically in this case equivalent to the full value of the property—a rent of 54 drachmae, at the usual rate of 8%, representing a property of approximately 7 minae. The repetition of *κατὰ* seems, however, rather to suggest that the proviso means 'εἰσφορά upon 7 minae, according to the assessment'; that is to say, if the lessor were required to pay *εἰσφορά*, upon his whole estate, at the rate e.g. of 1% upon  $\frac{1}{5}$  of it, the lessee covenanted to pay the amount due in respect of the part here leased to him and valued for this purpose at 7 minae, viz. 1% upon  $\frac{1}{5}$  minae or 1½ drachmae.

Further, Beloch's calculations appear somewhat arbitrary, if I may venture to dissent from so great an authority.

Thus (i.) he estimates the number of slaves at 60,000 to 80,000, and the average value of a slave at 1½ minae.

Athenaeus, however (6. 272 B), cites Ctesicles as recording that a census was taken at Athens in the days of Demetrius of Phalerum, and 'that there were found to be 21,000 citizens, 10,000 metics, and *οἰκετῶν μυριάδας μ'*. No plausible emendation of the last number suggests itself, and if the figures are accepted as correct in the case of citizens and metics (as is usually done), there is no reason why we should demur to the 400,000 slaves; there may, no doubt, be some exaggeration, but it cannot be so great as Beloch supposes. It may perhaps be beside the mark to quote Thucydides, who tells us (vii. 27) that 20,000 slaves took refuge in Deceleia—an incredible proportion of Beloch's 60,000 or 80,000, as a very large proportion of the slaves at Athens must have been female slaves, and those who ran away would be practically all of them males—because it may be replied that there may have been many more slaves in 413 B.C. than in 354 B.C. But how are we to account for Demos-

thenes' computations in this very speech (§ 13)? He suggests raising '1,000 horse, hoplites as many as one wants, and crews for 300 ships': the latter item alone would require 60,000 men, the crew of each ship being about 200, and pre-supposes the intention to employ at least 40,000 or 50,000 male slaves as rowers.

Next for the average price of a slave. No doubt this is somewhat uncertain. Yet Xenophon (*Mem.* 2, v. § 2) represents Socrates as saying 'one slave is worth 2 minae, another  $\frac{1}{2}$  a mina, another 5 minae, another as much as 10, and Nicias once gave a talent for a slave to act as overseer at the mines': even neglecting valuable slaves, worth 10 minae or more, we get an average value for ordinary slaves of  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , not  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , minae, and the probability is that the price would have gone up rather than down in the course of the fifty years since Socrates' death.

(ii.) Beloch estimates the *ἐπιπλά* at Athens at 1,000 talents, because Polybius (2. 62, § 4) declares that the value of the *ἐπιπλά* of all Peloponnesus did not amount to 6,000 talents in his own day; but surely this is not justifiable in view of the fact that there was only one important commercial city (Corinth) in the whole of the peninsula. Demosthenes himself tells us in this speech (§ 25) that the wealth of Athens was comparable with that of all other cities *ἐν ταύτῃ χρήματ' ἔνεστιν ὀλίγου δέω πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς ἄλλας εἰπεῖν πόλεις*. The *ἐπιπλά* of Attica must have been worth more than that of Laconia, or any other of the six divisions of Peloponnesus.

(iii.) Beloch estimates 'vineyards, olive plantations, woods, pasture-land, and buildings' at 2,000 talents. It is difficult adequately to estimate many of these items, I think; but it would seem that the 31,000 citizens and metics (most of whom would be married) must have required some 20,000 houses to live in, and these alone could hardly have been worth much less than 2,000 talents, although Xenophon (*Oecon.* 2, § 3) is, I fear, too vague to be of much use in determining the average value of a house in Athens.

On the other hand, that the collective property of the Athenians must have

been worth some '40,000 talents may, I think, be shown by the following considerations.

In the speech against Leptines' law (delivered in 354 B.C.), Demosthenes discusses (§ 19) the number of additional Choregi which Leptines' law would secure. He says, οἱ μὲν τοίνυν πλουσιώτατοι τριηραρχοῦντες αἰεὶ τῶν χορηγιῶν ἀτελεῖς ὑπάρχουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐλάττω τῶν ἱκανῶν κεκτημένοι . . . ἔξω τοῦ τέλους εἰσὶ τοῦτου. This passage is no doubt difficult, but the difficulty vanishes if we take αἰεὶ to mean 'permanently,' and not 'from time to time,' and recognise that the 1,200 richest citizens were under Periander's system exempt from the minor liturgies because permanently responsible for the trierarchy. Two passages (Isaeus iii. § 80, and Demosthenes xxvii. § 64, c. *Aphobum* 1) show conclusively that no one could be called upon to serve any liturgy whatever, unless he possessed an estate of three talents. The πλουσιώτατοι, then, must have in every case possessed some four talents at the least, and many must have possessed much more. Demosthenes, who belonged to the wealthiest class, inherited fifteen talents. We may, then, fairly assume that they possessed seven or eight talents each on an average, or a total of 9,000 talents. The other 30,000 citizens and metics could not have possessed less than 30,000 between them.

Another suggestion is made by Gilbert himself, viz. that the *τίμημα* was the *maximum εἰσφορά* which could be demanded. But liability to a tax of 20 % on capital is absurd, and Demosthenes himself says in this speech (§ 27) that the Athenians would not hear of  $\frac{1}{12}$  of the *τίμημα* (the supposed legal maximum) being demanded. No doubt he is speaking before hostilities had actually commenced, yet it is not the mere imposition of an *εἰσφορά*, but the imposition of an *εἰσφορά* of that amount that he says that his countrymen would not tolerate, and, as a matter of fact, the *εἰσφορά*, as we know, amounted regularly not to  $\frac{1}{12}$  (8 $\frac{1}{3}$ %) of the *τίμημα*, but to  $\frac{1}{100}$ . That was the average that his guardians paid during the ten years 378-368 B.C. for Demosthenes (18 minae on a *τίμημα* of 3 talents (= 180 minae) in

ten years, viz. 1 % per annum), and upon the only occasion since the system of Nausinicus had been introduced upon which the amount raised by εἰσφορά is specified, viz. in the year following this speech, the sum raised was 60 talents, that is (as before)  $\frac{1}{10}$  of the τίμημα (Demosth. *Olynth.* iii. § 4). The other instance cited by Boeckh (p. 521) from the *Androtion*, § 44, I hope I have correctly explained otherwise; see *Classical Review*, 1892, p. 123. My emendation has, at least, the approval of the late Professor Butcher in his edition of the text.

In conclusion I wish to call attention to the figures in § 29 οἷδε μὲν γε διακοσίαις τριήρεσιν, ὧν ἑκατὸν παρεσχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς, τοὺς προγόνους αὐτοῦ χιλίας ἀπολέσαντας ναῦς, ἀκούσεται δὲ τριακόσιας αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς νῦν παρεσκευασμένους.

The number of Greek ships and of Athenian ships that fought at Salamis is variously represented. Aeschylus (*Persae* 338) states that the total number of Greek ships was 300, or, as some understand, 310.

Ἑλλησιν μὲν ἦν  
ὁ πᾶς ἀριθμὸς ἐς τριακάδας δέκα  
νεῶν, δεκάς δ' ἦν τῶνδε χωρὶς ἑκκρίτος.

Herodotus, 8. 48, gives the total as 378. In Thucydides 1. 74 the number is given as 400. Herodotus, 8. 44, says that the Athenians furnished 180; but in 8. 1 he tells us that at Artemisium the Chalcidians manned 20 ships furnished by the Athenians, and Diodorus xv, 78 represents the Athenian contin-

gent as 200 at Salamis. More important, however, in considering this sentence in Demosthenes is Demosthenes' own statement *de Corona*, § 238, τριακοσίων οὐσῶν τῶν πασῶν, τὰς διακοσίας ἢ πόλις παρέσχετο.

It will, I think, be admitted that the antithesis will be greatly improved by reading τριακοσίαις for διακοσίαις — 300 ships then from all Greece, 300 now from Athens alone—and, further, that it is incredible that Demosthenes, on such an occasion, would have irritated his audience by stating that they supplied only 100 ships. He would, however, wish to point the contrast as vigorously as he could, and we may therefore expect to find him here ignoring the 20 Athenian ships which were manned by Chalcidians at Artemisnia, and stating that the Athenian contingent was 180, as Herodotus states. It is at least a curious coincidence that the numerical error, if error it be, can in both cases be easily accounted for; if we assume (i.) that τ' dropped out before τ of τριήρεσι and ε, the last letter of the preceding word, being supposed to conceal the required number, C' (for ε') was wrongly inserted to make good the deficiency, and (ii.) that π' was omitted before παρεσχόμεθα, we shall at once obtain what we require, οἷδε μὲν γε τ' (τριακοσίαις) τριήρεσιν ὧν ρ' π' (ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα) παρεσχόμεθ' ἡμεῖς. . . . Both of these possibilities appear to me to be highly probable.

J. R. WARDALE.

#### NOTE ON THE PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE *PROMETHEUS VINCTUS* OF AESCHYLUS AND THE *ANTIGONE* OF SOPHOCLES.

AN ancient critic says: 'If anyone thinks that Sophocles was a more perfect master of the tragic art than Aeschylus, no doubt he is right, but let him consider how much harder it was after Thespis and Phrynichus and Choerilus to raise tragedy to such a height than, writing after Aeschylus, to arrive at the perfection of Sophocles.'

This just criticism raises the question now far Sophocles was indebted to

Aeschylus for his conception and practice of the tragic art. He probably owed much more to his forerunner than Shakespeare did to Marlowe, though he did not eclipse him in anything like the same way. With the materials that time has left us it is impossible to trace the full extent of the debt, but a comparison of the *Prometheus* and the *Antigone* will throw some light upon it.

In the first place we find that the

very subject of the *Antigone* is based upon the facts to which Aeschylus in his *Septem c. Thebas* was apparently the first to give currency, that Creon by edict forbade the burial of Polyneices, and that Antigone resolved to defy the prohibition. The situation thus created is, however, treated by Sophocles in a manner totally different from that of Aeschylus. The Chorus in the *Antigone* do not support and uphold the heroine, nor do they rally round Creon. Still, Creon and Antigone correspond in conception closely with Zeus and Prometheus. In both cases the will of a superior and lawful sovereign has been set at nought, and in both the revolt is justified on the grounds of duty and humanity. Antigone is willing even to die that she may satisfy her conscience. She sacrifices her civic loyalty to keep the unwritten law of loyalty to her kin. Prometheus cannot die, but is ready to endure ages of anguish rather than surrender helpless mankind to the tyranny of Zeus. He will not give up his 'man-befriending ways' for all the enmity of the coterie of Gods.

Curiously enough there has been in respect to either play a divergence of opinion as to the real sentiments of the poet towards his protagonist. With regard to Prometheus, Shelley is the best-known exponent of the view that Aeschylus really sided with his hero, as he seems at first sight clearly to do, against Zeus, and meant us to consider the latter wholly wrong in the quarrel. So, on the other hand, there are some who hold that Sophocles wished us to look upon Antigone as the transgressor and Creon as acting within his rights. But surely the true view is the reverse in either case. Creon is wrong and Zeus is right. Indeed, the latter fact comes out quite clearly in the *Prometheus Freed*, but in the play which we have our feelings are wholly, and rightly, on the side of the Titan, who suffers for our sakes, and we rejoice in the tender sympathy of the Chorus for the champion of mankind.

The fault of Prometheus and of Antigone was the same (*αὐθαδία*), self-will, but self-will in a good and inspiring cause. They could both say: 'None but I alone resisted this decree' (*P.V.*

234). As Antigone is led away to execution, she cries: 'See what I suffer and at what men's hands for cherishing with reverent heart the reverend ordinances of Heaven!' (*Ant.* 942). So Prometheus, nailed to the rock, when left alone by his tormentors, calls, in almost identical terms, on the Elemental Powers: 'See what guerdon I, a God, from Gods have won!' (*P.V.* 92), and his last words, as he sinks into the depths of Tartarus, refer, like those of Antigone, to his unjust sufferings.

Much of the diction of the *Antigone* shows an acquaintance with the earlier play, e.g. ἀπιστεῖν = disobey (*P.V.* 640: *Ant.* 219); Σαλμυδησός (*P.V.* 726: *Ant.* 970); ταγός = king (*P.V.* 96: *Ant.* 1057); κουφόνους (*P.V.* 383: *Ant.* 343, 617); ἐπίχειρα = guerdon (*P.V.* 319: *Ant.* 820); κατῶρυξ (*P.V.* 452: *Ant.* 774); ἄθλος = ordeal (*P.V.* 702, 752: *Ant.* 856); and ἐπαιτῶμαι, the use of which in *Ant.* 490 points out the probable construction and reading in *P.V.* 674.

Similarities of construction abound in the two plays, such as, among others, πίπτουσι πτώματ' αἰσχρά (*Ant.* 1046: *P.V.* 919). Δράτω φρονεῖτω (*Ant.* 768) is an echo of δράτω κρατεῖτω (*P.V.* 937), and the curious asyndeton, καὶ ξυμμετίσχω καὶ φέρω τῆς αἰτίας (*Ant.* 937) is apparently modelled on πάντων μετασχὼν καὶ τετολημκὼς ἐμοί (*P.V.* 331), and so supports the M.S. reading as against Jebb's emendation συντετολημκὼς.

Noticeable, too, are the following resemblances:

λόγοι δ' ἐν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐρρόθουν κακοί,  
φύλαξ ἐλέγχων φύλακα (*Ant.* 259),

which exactly repeats the use of ἀλλήλοισιν and the loose construction of the nominative in *P.V.* 200.

Ζεὺς γὰρ μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους ὑπερχθαίρει (*Ant.* 127, cp. 473), which shows traces of τῆς ἄγαν ὑψηγόρου γλώσσης (*P.V.* 318) and ὅς (sc. Ζεὺς) αὐτὸν ἐξέπληξε τῶν ὑψηγόρων κομπασμάτων (*P.V.* 360).

Even closer reminiscences are ἐπὶ-βολος φρενῶν (*Ant.* 492: *P.V.* 446); μόχθος περισσός (*P.V.* 383), which becomes πόνος περισσός in *Ant.* 780; and ἔξω φέρομαι θεσμών, *Ant.* 802, with which compare *P.V.* 881.



Again, *πτύσας* (*Ant.* 652) reminds us of *ἀπέπτυσα* (*P.V.* 1069); *τοῦτο ταύτη* (*Ant.* 722) is similar to *ταῦτα ταύτη* (*P.V.* 511); and the exclamatory accusative *σὲ δὴ, σὲ τὴν νεύουσας* (*Ant.* 441) without a governing verb parallels the like construction in *P.V.* 944, *σὲ τὸν σοφιστήν . . . τὸν πυρὸς κλέπτῃν λέγω*, where *λέγω* seems to have its common sense, 'I mean.'

From the above it will be seen that Sophocles in this case built partly on the foundations laid by Aeschylus, but that he here excelled the elder dramatist is by no means so clear. As a character, Prometheus wins our affection and admiration more than Antigone. The time-serving and self-satisfied Oceanus, set against his counterpart Ismene, will be found to be more vividly portrayed, though not so sympathetic a figure as the sister of Antigone. Creon is an inferior Zeus. He acts from a right motive, but having once taken up a wrong position, he refuses, with all the obstinacy of a weak nature, to give way until it is too late. One feels a little sorry for him. Zeus, on the other hand, though right in his quarrel with Prometheus, has been wrong in other matters, and has to render an account

to Powers that are above, and behind even Him. When He has made his peace with the Moirae, then Prometheus too must make his peace with Zeus, and wear the willow of contrition. Heracles is to be the intermediary between them; and, curiously enough, there is a vase extant which represents Heracles interceding with Creon for Haemon and Antigone (see Jebb, *Antigone, Introd.*, p. xl.).

The Chorus in the Prometheus show as much heroism as Antigone, and, at the last, dare the vengeance of Zeus himself rather than desert their kinsman when he and they are swallowed up by the earth. At the same time, though firm in their resolve, they are more womanly than the heroine of Sophocles, and have none of her self-consciousness or hardness. The stern, cold Antigone scarcely alludes to her lover, rebuffs her sister, and has a somewhat unseemly altercation with Creon. It is only when death is close upon her that her reserve breaks down and she turns to the Chorus for a sympathy which it is not in them to give her.

C. R. HAINES.

*Mazagon, Godalming.*

#### VARIA.

AESCHYLUS *Persae* 184. Atossa in her dream saw two female figures

μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα πολὺ  
κάλλει τ' ἁμώμω.

τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα is only suitable to two real persons, the tallest that now are: it could not be used of unreal images in a dream, and those images standing for countries, not for persons. Read then *ἐκπρεπεστέρα*. In *Septem* 598 the MSS. vary between *δυσσεβεστέροις* and *δυσσεβεστάτοις*.

Lines 537-540 *πολλαὶ δ' . . . μετέχουσαι* should be placed after 545. As they stand, *πολλαὶ* has nothing to refer to, while *αἱ δ' ἄβρόγοι Περσίδες* are introduced in 541 as though the *πολλαὶ* were quite different people. If it be said that the change would bring two

paroemiacs too close together, cf. *Agam.* 1340-2 and 1491-3.

\* \*

Soph. *Fragm.* 787. The new moon

ἐξ ἀδήλου πρῶτον ἔρχεται νέα  
πρόσωπα καλλύνουσα καὶ πληρούμενη,

and presently dwindles again *κάπὶ μηδὲν ἔρχεται*. Now it is true that Sophocles, like other Greek poets, is less careful than we are to avoid the recurrence of a word. But *ἔρχεται* twice in four lines is rather a blemish, and in the first of them *ἄρχεται* would be quite suitable. *ἄρχομαι* sometimes takes a participle, though I cannot quote an instance from Attic verse. Here perhaps the participles need not be joined quite closely with it.



In O.T. 814

εἰ δὲ τῷ ξένῳ  
τούτῳ προσήκει Λαίου τι συγγενές

should we not read *προσῆκε*? We should not say in English of a man long dead 'if he has anything to do with Laius' (long dead), and it can hardly be proper in Greek either.

\* \*

Aristoph. *Clouds* 470.

βουλομένους ἀνακοινοῦσθαι τε καὶ ἐς  
λόγον ἐλθεῖν  
πράγματα κἀντιγραφεὺς πολλῶν ταλάν-  
των  
ἄξια σῇ φρενὶ συμβουλευσομένους μετὰ  
σοῦ.

The construction of this is doubtful in one or two points. But in any case it would be improved by transposing the second and third lines, so as to join ἄξια with πράγματα.

\* \*

Hymn to Aphrodite 228

πολλὰ κατέχυντο ἔθειραι  
καλῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς εὐηγενέος τε γενείου.

Common sense requires *on*, not *from*, his head; not *ἐκ*, but *κάκ*.

\* \*

Apoll. Rhod. 4. 1604.

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ θοὸν ἵππον ἐς εὐρέα κύκλον  
ἀγῶνος  
στέλλῃ ὀρεξάμενος λαοίης εὐπειθέα  
χαίτης.

'Holding the docile creature by the mane' (Mooney). But ὀρέγομαι never means anything like *hold*, and ὀρέγομαι with an accusative is unnatural. No doubt Apollonius wrote *δραξάμενος*, constructing it with the accusative which we find in later Greek. In Plutarch's *Aemilius Paulus* 26 the old reading was *γονάτων ὀρεξάμενος*, but 'δραξάμενος R(eiske) et codex Zonaræ 9, 23' says Sintenis.

In 1. 43 read ὀπλότατος for ὀπλότερος (cf. 157, 180, and on Aesch. *Pers.* above): 3. 613 the aorist *μειλίξαιτο* seems impossible for an unsuccessful attempt (*μειλίσσοιτο* ?): 3. 676 read *θευμορίη*.

\* \*

Babrius 10. 5. A slave-girl

πᾶσαν (or πάση) μάχην συνήπτεν οἰκο-  
δεσποίνῃ.

For *πᾶσαν*, which is unsatisfactory, we might read *ἵσην*. 15. 11 runs ὁ δ' ἄλλος ὡς Βοιωτὸς οὐκ ἔχων ἵσην λόγους ἄμιλλαν κ.τ.λ.

\* \*

Plutarch *Romulus* 5. Laurentia was shut up in the temple, ὡς δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔξοντος αὐτήν. Probably εἰσιόντος αὐτῇ. ἐξ and εἰς are apt to get exchanged.

\* \*

Plato *Laws* 965A πότερον οὕτω λέγομεν ἢ πῶς ἄλλως δεῖν κατὰσκευ-  
άζεσθαι (τὴν πόλιν); μὴν ὁμοίους πάντας κεκτημένους καὶ μὴ διηκριβωμένους ἔστιν οὗς κ.τ.λ.

For *κεκτημένους*, which is unmeaning, read *κεκτημένην*, comparing 964D τοιαύτην τινα φυλακὴν κεκτημένην ἐν αὐτῇ. It was assimilated in termination, as often happens, to the neighbouring words.

\* \*

Demosth. *de Cor.* 289. In the verses quoted I suggest that, adopting Weil's *πάτρας μὲν ἑκάς σφετέρας* (as Blass did, though not Butcher), we should then transpose the second and third couplets. οὐνεκεν ἀλλήλων goes much more properly with ἀντιπάλων ὕβριν ἀπεσκέδασαν than with Ἀἶδην κοινὸν ἔθεντο βραβῆ, while Ἀἶδην leads naturally to what is said in 7-8 of their dead bodies. οὐνεκεν Ἑλλήνων could not so well be brought near to *πάτρας ἔνεκα σφετέρας*, if we retained that reading, though it would not be impossible. In the present line 3 I feel no great difficulty about governing the genitive by βραβῆ.

F.L. 284 ὅτι τοῦτον εἶδεν ἀδικοῦντα. Would not ἦδεν be better?

Symmor. 24. ὑπάρχειν should, I think, be ὑπάρξειν. This kind of error is very frequent, and the future is more suitable. Nor need εἰς τότε mean *against that time*, for in expressions about the future εἰς constantly means *at* some time, e.g. in εἰσαυθὺς hereafter.

Leptines 36 πρὸς ὅσης κακίας ὑπερβολὴν . . . προάγει. Rather ὅσην. τοσαύτη ὑπερβολή is common. In 55 should we insert (say) ἐφάνημεν after

## THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

ποιούντες? 125 πανουργότατον λόγον  
for κακουργότατον?

Philippic I. 10 'λέγεται τι καινόν';  
γένοιτ' ἂν τι καινότερον κ.τ.λ.; I do not  
feel sure that we should not read λέγοιτ'

ἂν for γένοιτ' ἂν. The parts of γί-  
γνομαι and λέγομαι certainly inter-  
change; sometimes both appear as  
various readings in MSS.

H. RICHARDS.

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERJECTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENTENCE.

I. In the following paper I propose to  
show that the fundamental type of sen-  
tence consists of a vocative and an im-  
perative, that the vocative and impera-  
tive forms are primitive, and that they  
are derived from the interjection. If  
my attempt is successful, it will be  
necessary to revise and even to recast  
the traditional scheme of grammar.

The Report of the Joint Committee  
on Grammatical Terminology presents  
in the clearest possible form the outlines  
of grammar as understood by English  
scholars of to-day. It has seemed best  
therefore to offer what I have to say, in  
the form of a criticism upon their re-  
port. It may save misunderstanding  
further if I admit that I do not regard  
language simply as an expression of  
thought but as an expression of the  
whole personality. This is really the  
main point at issue.

I have not been so unreasonable as to  
suppose that the committee were blind  
to the obvious facts with which I have  
to deal, and therefore I have tried to  
give them credit for an amount of sym-  
pathy which does not appear on the  
surface of their report. Perhaps the  
tone of my paper may seem offensive.  
The size of the committee must be my  
excuse. The virtues of a committee are  
usually in inverse ratio to its size.

When Horace asked the question:  
*ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?* he ap-  
pealed to the example of the Roman  
teachers of Latin who, we are told,  
handed buns round in order to relieve  
the monotony of Latin grammar. Now  
although Horace uses the plural, *doc-  
tores*, it must be understood that the  
distribution of buns was made by the  
individual teacher and not by the Roman  
committee on *elementa prima*. When,  
therefore, Lucilius said: *gustavi crustula*

*solus*, we must suppose that he had a  
teacher all to himself. But laughter,  
as Sterne says, 'adds something to our  
fragment of life,' and is therefore better  
than a bun. If it is impossible to  
combine the statement of grammatical  
principles with amusement, I must  
throw up my hands, and confess that,  
on my interpretation of the facts of  
language, there is room for an occasional  
chuckle.

II. The current method of Latin  
grammar is based upon the logical ana-  
lysis of written expression. I say Latin  
grammar, because in what follows we  
shall be mainly concerned with Latin.  
But this will not prevent us from getting  
light from Greek and English grammar,  
and to be quite candid from throwing a  
little light upon both English and  
Greek grammar. The reader may  
think this promise somewhat presump-  
tuous, and, indeed, I should not have  
ventured upon it, if I had not felt that  
the Joint Committee on Grammatical  
Terminology in their report had not  
given sufficient place to language as  
expressing impulse and emotion. On  
p. 15 the decree goes forth 'that sen-  
tences be classified as follows in all the  
five languages: statements, questions,  
and the expressions of desire.' Ex-  
clamations are relegated to a note and  
are limited to a certain class of sen-  
tences: 'Those introduced by pro-  
nouns, adjectives, or adverbs, which in  
other contexts are either interrogative  
or relative, but are here exclamatory.'

However admirable the Latin gram-  
mar (as understood by the committee)  
may be, it does not cover the whole of  
the ground; it does not account ade-  
quately for the phenomena of *oral* ex-  
pression. We are compelled therefore  
to go further afield, and in doing so we

light at once upon a considerable number of fresh facts. And these facts group themselves round the interjection. Quite independently of my preparations for this paper, I came across a striking passage in Tylor's *Primitive Culture* (I<sup>3</sup>, 176). 'The philologist's concern with [interjections] is to study their action in expressing emotion, and to trace their passage into more fully formed words.' The whole of Dr. Tylor's chapters on emotional and imitative language may be referred to as a foundation for the argument which follows.

We must begin by facing the question fairly: what is the object to which grammarians direct themselves? Do they mean written language or spoken language? To this I reply that all language properly so-called is to be regarded as spoken. It is only by an accident that it comes to be written. Language therefore is *oral* expression. And we should remind ourselves, on the one hand, that much oral expression is incapable of being reduced to writing, and, on the other hand, that much writing which passes for language is nothing of the kind.

III. But oral expression is only one form of human expression. A true workman expresses himself in his work, as do the engineers who keep our great steamships going, and so on. It throws the whole subject of grammar out of key if we confine ourselves to written language and to statements and questions which, as the committee say, correspond to logical judgments.

IV. I am glad that the committee referred to logical judgments. They are evidently conscious that grammar cannot be understood entirely from within itself. And in their wish to get help they have had recourse to psychology. For, although Kant has said that there is no such science as psychology, he has been confuted by the history of that science. And I am encouraged to fall back upon my own limited knowledge of psychology by the example of the committee. We shall not treat human beings therefore simply as giving rise to articulate sounds which can be reduced to order with the help of the logician. Now, since the majority of

the readers of the *Classical Review* are scarcely likely to know so much psychology as the committee, I will warn them of their danger lest they should fall into a dreadful heresy which is known as the 'faculty psychology.' By this is meant that one separates thought from feeling, and both from will; as though you could conduct your thoughts without being influenced by feelings, and *vice versâ*; or as though you could either think or feel or act without at the same time doing something of all three.

V. Now it is because the committee are unlikely to have fallen into so obvious a mistake that I venture to carry out what, I am sure, must have been their intention. In their report on Grammatical Terminology they omitted to say very much about the oral expression of feeling, not because they overlooked the facts which I have stumbled upon, but because it is very difficult to get a committee to agree upon everything, and they felt that if we regarded grammar as mainly an exercise in the logical judgment, it was at least something. Most practical grammarians are uncomfortable in the presence of feeling and action; and after trying to make room in my own case for the expression of feeling and action, I am inclined to sympathise.

VI. At the same time we must not shrink from following out this topic somewhat further. If we are to be complete grammarians, we must study in a little detail the behaviour of human beings, so that we may understand the manner in which their behaviour finds expression in language. In particular, what is the stage at which man, as a matter of course, employs statements and questions which, as the committee says, correspond to logical judgments? This high estimate which the committee entertains of the human intellect came as somewhat of a shock to me, because I had always understood that by nature man was imperfectly equipped with reason, and that the use of Latin grammar in education was to supply this imperfection in the work of the Creator. Monsieur Anatole France has expressed a similar thought in his own incom-

parable way. He is looking back to the good old times. 'By learning Latin the pupils learnt something infinitely more precious than Latin. They learnt the art of directing and expressing their thought.' Now, although I cannot claim to have entered into the full possession of this heritage, it is obviously necessary that we should find a place in our scheme of human behaviour for that delightful attitude of mind which, owing to their study of Latin, the committee shares with Monsieur France. This we will call the attitude of *understanding*, expressed in statements and questions which correspond to logical judgments.

VII. But what is the typical attitude or attitudes of the great mass of mankind, including the skilful engineer and myself? At any rate we can use things for our own ends, even if we cannot reflect upon them very clearly. The engineer's vocabulary would perhaps illustrate the subject of this paper with more emphasis than would suit the pages of the report on Grammatical Terminology. But this could at least be said about him: he would be perfectly sincere. There would be no affectation of making statements which correspond to logical judgments. Without going into unnecessary detail, many engineers use interjections, vocatives, imperatives and other exclamations in the most vivid way. This is the primitive attitude of man contending with his surroundings and using such tools as come to hand. We can all reach, or pass through, this attitude. Hence we can now proceed to mark off two attitudes of man—first, that of *practice* or *use*; second, that of *understanding*.

VIII. It is difficult to make some people (especially those scientific men who have learnt Latin) understand that there is an experience higher than the formation of logical judgments. Mankind cannot be dismissed offhand into two classes: those who have learnt 'the art of directing and expressing their thought,' and those less fortunate ones who have not so learnt. There is a third attitude of man to other persons and things—namely, the attitude of *sympathy*. We no longer contemplate things and persons from the outside; we enter into their intentions and tendencies. Now it

is quite possible to be deeply sympathetic, and yet to fail of that logical perfection towards which we are conducted by Latin grammar. Dr. Fennell, in his excellent edition of Pindar's *Odes*, was perplexed by the style of the poet, and delivered himself as follows: 'Most of the difficulties in Pindar's *Odes* arise from his rapidity and fulness of thought, which often seems to have made him sacrifice the formal expression of the connexion of his ideas.' This statement is not altogether clear, but I understand it to mean that Pindar's attitude to life was not one of calm understanding. For no state of mere understanding would make us 'sacrifice the formal expression of the connexion of our ideas.' On the contrary, where you have perfect understanding 'all is ordered luminous, simple.' I am quoting Monsieur France on Livy. 'Livy is not a profound genius; but he is a perfect pedagogue. He never moves us, and for that reason we read him without any keen pleasure. But how regularly he thinks! How pleased he is to show his thought, to examine all the pieces of it, and to explain the part which each of them plays!' I said to myself when I read this passage: 'There is a description of the committee on Grammatical Terminology.' At the same time, among the members of that committee, I recognise the names of several friends of mine whose knowledge of Pindar is much greater than any to which I can myself aspire. They are in the committee, but not entirely of it. They show that it is possible not only to utter sentences and questions which correspond to logical judgments, but to penetrate further into the heart of things, and to unveil the hidden things of the classical literatures. Neither understanding nor the absence of understanding is the key to this third form of apprehension, but a heart that vibrates in response to the eternal voices. At any rate, I can count upon their assent to the very modest proposition which I will lay down now as the main thesis of this paper: *the analysis of language from a logical standpoint does not account for all the forms of which grammar must take account*. Or, in other words, oral expression is organically related not only to thought, but to action and feeling.



IX. Some one may say, however, that the committee have made adequate provision for the expression of feeling, on p. 15, in their third category of *desire*. But for some reason or other they are careful to distinguish sentences expressing desire from exclamations, and therefore from the expression of feeling. I will confess that I do not understand the point of view of the committee. Surely the expression of desire involves the expression of feeling! Desires, we are told, include commands, requests, entreaties, wishes. From this it would appear that desires roughly answer to the use of the imperative mood. And this is the sense in which I shall take leave to understand the expression of desire. From our point of view we shall regard the imperative mood as an ejaculation, no less than the fourth form of sentence which is so regarded by the committee.

Curiously enough if we examine the exclamations which the committee separate from the other forms of sentence, they will be found to consist at the root in nouns used as ejaculations. *Que de fleurs! what nonsense!* ὦ βάθος πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ. There is reason to think that the verb in such phrases as *Ut perii* is no real exception. We may compare the phrase with *O me miserum!*

X. Now if we combine the imperative mood with the vocative, which is the simplest form of the noun used in ejaculations (that is, if we combine the committees 'expressions of desire' with their 'exclamation'), we arrive at a well-defined form of sentence: *Ave, Caesar; Lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque; Quaeve novum vatem, tenerorum mater amorum*. In English we have: *Blow, blow, thou winter wind; Go, lovely rose; Ruin seize thee, ruthless king; and so on*. Such sentences are the proper expression of feeling and action. They are specially characteristic of everyday life. Any one can satisfy himself of this by listening to the passers-by.

But I do not think it has been observed that this type of sentence is frequent enough in literature to demand special attention. I open by chance, *Every Man in his Humour*. The first words of the dialogue are:

A goodly day toward! and a fresh morning!  
Brainworm,  
Call up young master. Bid him rise, Sir;  
Tell him I have some business to employ him.

Two interjections and then two sentences that begin the action of the play. Take a case where such sentences interrupt the current of ordinary statements. How beautifully, in the parabasis of the *Knights*, two such sentences occur! the prayers to Poseidon and Athena. We want a name for this sort of sentence. Perhaps the term *active* is as good as we can find. Such a sentence is more than a bare imperative: it is more than a bare vocative. There must be the combination of the noun and the verb. If we wanted a technical description, perhaps the term *judgment* would be convenient. Unfortunately the term judgment has been confined by the grammarians and logicians and psychologists to something which is not so much a judgment, as a theoretic opinion.

For to judge is more than to hold an opinion. When we judge we express both our feeling towards an event or person, and the demand which arises out of such a feeling.

We are prepared now to meet a striking fact. The Lord's Prayer is *exclusively* composed of active sentences or judgments. It begins with a vocative which is understood along with all the succeeding expressions of desire. In like manner the National Anthem illustrates throughout the type of sentence with which we are occupied.

In the distinction which we have thus established between the active and the theoretic sentences, we secure a touchstone of style. Of course, now that the distinction has been pointed out the writers of prize poems will doubtless take account of it. But it is interesting to thread one's way through the jungle of English hymns with this as a clue. Most of our fine hymns begin with an active sentence. Where, however, the first sentence is of the narrative form, the effect is rarely tolerable, unless the verb is one of prayer or praise. I cannot refrain from one instance of an obvious failure. The congregation is addressing God, and they begin with the tame state-



ment of the time: *The day is past and over!* I should like to think that a similar line of inquiry may lead, in the hands of abler critics, to important results in the classical literatures.

XI. I do not wish to pride myself unduly upon the discovery which was announced in the last paragraph. For the committee on Grammatical Terminology were only prevented from making it by their admirable but excessive devotion to the philosophy of Aristotle. They recommend on p. 8, 'that the first stage in the analysis of a sentence be to divide it into two parts, to be called the subject and the predicate.' For example: *The merciful man is merciful to his beast.* Here *is merciful to his beast* is the predicate and *the merciful man* is the subject. Now in the philosophy of Aristotle, the subject is regarded as the substrate of qualities, and the predicate is attached to this substrate. Aristotle frequently employs another turn of phrase. He says τὸ β ὑπάρχει τῷ α as well as τὸ α ἐστὶ τὸ β. If we paraphrase our typical sentence it will run: *The quality of being merciful to his beast pertains to the merciful man.* In other words, the analysis of the sentence into subject and predicate turns upon the Aristotelian conception of substance. Hence, what the committee speaks of as a sentence (p. 8) is really a theoretic opinion expressed in the form of Aristotelian logic. If only the committee could have shaken off the trammels of logic! Let the reader compare the beginning of my tenth section with the contents of the preceding section; he will see that I rightly acknowledged my indebtedness to p. 15 of the report. The committee describe Statements and Questions indeed in accordance with the rules of Aristotle (compare p. 8). But when they are left to themselves they describe Desires and Exclamations in such a way, that we only needed to combine the two in order to obtain the judgment proper or active sentence.

XII. We are now going to take the *active sentence* as the type to which other forms of sentence may be referred. We begin by discarding the term *subject* from grammar. There is no useful

office performed by this word, which cannot be rendered by the term *person*. The *subject* of the verb is the *person* of the verb. And, if you say that a person is not a thing, and therefore it is ridiculous to describe gold as a person in the phrase *gold glitters*, I reply that gold is a person, just as much as *it*, in *it glitters*, is the third person. But, further, gold is masculine in Greek and French; French can say of gold, *il brille*. Our use of the word *person*, therefore, answers to the fact of gender, and is more appropriate to the genius of language than the philosophical term *substrate*. In English we have still the *ship* to remind us of the time when gender applied to English nouns. In other words, *person* throws us back upon the time when all language palpitated with life.

XIII. The term *predicate* must be dismissed along with the term *subject*. For we are told by the committee, on page 8, that sentences are to be analysed into subject and predicate. Strictly speaking, the term predicate κατηγορούμενον should be limited to *assertions*. Hence expressions of desire scarcely admit of predicates in the proper sense. What, for example, is the predicate in *Long live the King?* The committee answers, *Long live*. But this is not merely asserted, it is commanded, or prayed for. I shall not labour this point further, but shall go on to the fourth form of sentence—exclamations. *How true! Que de fleurs!* We are told that the adverbs are exclamatory. In that case we have a phrase consisting of an exclamation and a nominal form. Here then, at any rate, there is no predicate.

Let us turn back to the active sentence. This consists of a vocative and a verb, or, as we may now say, a person and a verb. Does the *verb* supply us with the term we want. I think it does. The verb denotes movement and change, together with their contradictories. Even in the verbs that express rest, the rest is not static but dynamic. For example, the verb *to be* is completed in some language from the verb *to stand*, and the standing implies standing firm, that is, against resistance.

In a word, the active sentence refers action and reaction to a personal agent. The term predicate implies the bare addition of a label to an imperfectly developed object of thought. Hence the active sentence is infinitely more frequent in daily life than the logical sentence.

XIV. We have thus seen reason to lay down another type of sentence than that to which the distinction of subject and predicate applies. The active sentence answers to the language of common life as distinguished from the language of reflection. For this latter the logical sentence is appropriate. Unfortunately the grammarians have tried to reduce the active sentence to this latter type. In so doing they have not only distorted the language of ordinary busy life: they have failed to do justice to the language of sympathy and the deeper emotions generally.

XV. This will involve a recasting of grammar in order to make it correspond more closely to the order of facts. I will conclude by a brief summary of the lines along which the grammar, first of the interjection, second of the verb, and then of the noun, requires to be reconsidered.

XVI. The interjection will come first in our grammar. Do you remember how in Rudyard Kipling's story, *The Man Who Was*, the returned officer was recognised by the vowel sound upon which his weeping was pitched? This may serve as a parable for us. There is a profounder vernacular than that of articulate language. Man weeps, laughs, snores, wonders, rejoices.

Nor is the menagerie silent. Our own *cockadoodledoo* does not correspond to life so closely as the *co co co co* of Petronius, nor is *baa baa black sheep* so realistic as the *be be* of Greek literature.

XVII. Then will come the parts of speech which are nearest to the interjection. In the verb we must follow the example of Mr. Magnus in the *Pickwick Papers*, and conjugate ourselves into the imperative mood. There is considerable evidence that this was a primitive form. *Lauda, mone, rege, audi* are both the stems of verbs and the second singular of the imperative *Vel* falls into its place as the imperative

of *volo*. Compare the derivation of *if* from *gif*. The analogy of *vel* supports this derivation. *Dic, duc, fac, fer* help us to understand *vel*; the lack of the terminal vowel is due to the indeterminate character of the vowel which follows the stem in the third conjugation.

XVIII. The subjunctive is to be treated first as an ally of the imperative and ultimately of the interjection. *Benedicite* is paralleled by *benedicamus*. Where are we to draw the line as we conjugate *faciam, fac, faciat, faciamus, facite, faciant*? It is at this point, therefore, that the subjunctive must first enter our grammatical scheme. We must correct Roby therefore. 'The subjunctive mood,' he says, 'as distinguished from the indicative, expresses an action as thought or supposed, rather than as done or narrated.' The subjunctive is nearer than the indicative to the command, the interjection. It emphasises the will, the desire. Hence we contrast it as doing something, with the indicative which is the narrating of something. Nor can I accept without qualification the report on the *Terminology of Grammar*, xlii. The reference of the subjunctive to future time is only secondary; this reference arises from the imperative meaning which as we have seen, may be treated as primary. The committees quote the question: *quid faciam?* the reply should be *hoc age*. Certainly it would not run *hoc agere te oportebit*. The footnote of the committee is unfortunately phrased. The reference to the future is not intrinsic, but adventitious.

XIX. If we consider the example just given, we can see how the deliberative subjunctive arises out of the imperative. And from the deliberative there may come the use of the subjunctive in indirect questions. *Quid ab hac metuīs?* *Quid ego metuum, rogitas*. 'Do you inquire what I am to fear?' We might regard this indirect question as an independent clause, and compare the whole phrase with such constructions as *quid mihi dicent, demiror* (Ter. Ph. 234).

XX. The beginnings of the final construction may be seen in such collocations as *cura valeas*. Such constructions are obviously to be treated as primary, and are not to be explained

by the omission of *ut*. They may be compared with phrases like *iures postulo*. The misunderstanding of these constructions is due to the undue postponement of the imperative in the scheme of grammar.

In the limits of this paper I can only suggest the derivation of the deliberative and the final subjunctive from the imperative. The reader can consider for himself how the subjunctive after relative pronouns and adverbs, and also the subjunctive in reported speech, may be traced back to the imperative. English will furnish a clue. Our own indirect speech shows relations with the imperative. Dr. Johnson is perplexed by the use of *should be* in reported speech, and quotes Bacon: 'There is a fabulous narration, that in the northern countries there *should be* an herb that groweth in the likeness of a lamb.' Compare an idiom still current: He is one who *should* know. *Est qui sciat*.

XXI. Turning to the noun, we shall at once be led to the vocative as the typical interjectional case, and as the nearest to the primitive form. Like the imperative, the vocative (where

there is a form separate from the nominative) contains the stem. This is seen more clearly in Greek. Owing to the importance of the vocative, both actually in speaking and historically, it would seem appropriate to put it before the nominative.

XXII. The interjectional use of the dative is seen in phrases like *quid mihi Celsus agit?* Now it is probable that the case endings of personal pronouns are older than other case endings. Hence we will venture to argue from the form of *mihi*. The ending *-hi* is probably implosive—that is to say, a gasp. The whole group of endings, *-hi*, *-bi*, in Latin, and *-φι* in Greek, may be compared with the interjection, *hie*, and its cognates (*cf.* Sweet, *History of Language*, p. 35). It is tempting to imagine that the *i* which is common to all dative singulars in Latin was developed by analogy from *mihi*.

XXIII. I have offered these few illustrations of my main thesis, because they are fairly certain. To have gone further would unduly lengthen this paper.

FRANK GRANGER.

## NOTES

### THEOCRITUS, IDYLL XV. 112.

MSS.: *πὰρ μὲν οἱ ὄρια κείται, ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι*. Meineke points out that *μὲν οἱ* is unmetrical, as the digammated *Foi* should lengthen *μὲν* by position, cp. 25. 82. His own suggestion *ὁπώρα* is, however, hardly convincing. Perhaps the original reading was—*πὰρ μὲν ὅσ' ὄρια κείται, ὅσα δρυὸς ἄκρα φέροντι*, 'Beside him lie the season's fruits, even all that the oak-sprays bear.' For the use of *ὅσος* as correlative to *ὅσος*, cp. *Idyll* IV. 39, *ὅσον αἰγὴς ἐμὶν φίλαι, ὅσον ἀπέσβας*; Oppian *Cyneg.* 4. 210 *ὅσον χάδον ὅσον ἐρεξαν*. The letter change in uncials is of course slight, and might arise through misunderstanding of the idiom.

R. J. SHACKLE.

Marlborough College, Wilts.

### TERENCE, EUNUCHUS, 835-839.

PYTHIAS. Habemus hominem ipsum. THAIS. Ubi is est? PY. Em, ad sinisteram. Viden? TH. Video. PY. Comprendi iube, quantum potest. TH. Quid illo faciemus, stulta? PY. Quid facias rogas? Vide amabo, si non, quom aspicias, os impudens Videtur! TH. Non est? PY. Tum quae eius confidentias!

So these lines are given in Tyrrell's texts. L. 839 is the crux. The MSS. vary in attributing the *non est* either to Thais or to Pythias. For *non est tum* Fleckeisen and Wagner read *tum autem*, which has the merit of meaning something at least. But there is a well-defined type of comic sentence which can easily be extricated from beneath the débris of *non est tum*. Fabia quotes two examples in his note—

Quom faciem videas, videtur esse quantivis preti (Ter. Andr. 856).  
At facies quom adspicias eorum, haud mali videntur (Plaut. Pseud. 111).

On the analogy of these it is plain that we must construe *quom aspicias os impudens* together, and that the predicate of *videtur* is to seek.

Next, *quae eius confidentiast* is the regular idiom for 'such is his assurance,' or 'to judge by his assurance.' Whether taken in this sense or as an exclamation, the words give a healthy and complete meaning.

The problem then is simple and definite: to find under *non est tum* the missing predicate of *videtur*. The answer leaps out at you when you put the question straight. Read—

vide amabo si non, cum aspicias os impudens, videtur monstrum, quae eius confidentiast.

The word occurs in 656, 696, 860, always of the real eunuch, or to express the uncanny precocity of Chaerea's gallantries (aged sixteen). Pythias' extreme uneasiness (in the next scene) at the idea of Thais being left alone Chaerea is the best commentary on *monstrum*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.

#### HORACE, EPISTLES, II. i. 113-117.

nauem agere ignarus navis timet; abrotonum aegro  
non audet nisi qui didicit dare; quod medicorum est  
promittunt medici; tractant fabrilis fabri:  
scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.

BENTLEY'S objection to the tautology of bringing in the physician by name after he has already been brought in by figure has been felt by subsequent critics. *Nihil mutandum est*, says Orelli, *etiamsi haec repetitio laudari vix potest*.

A fault of taste is more improbable in the Second Book of the Epistles than anywhere in Horace. But, besides the point of taste, there is the further difficulty of *promittunt*. Kiessling coolly asserts that '*promittere*, like *profiteri*, is the proper word for a professional engagement.' The assertion seems to rest solely on Porphyrios' note *promittunt: profitentur*. No other instances are cited.

Nor is the force of Bentley's critical objection weakened by the inadequacy of his proposed substitute—

quod melicorum est  
promittunt melici,

which (it has been generally agreed) would mean not musicians, but lyric poets.

A change, palaeographically as slight as Bentley's suggestion, would be to read—

quod modicorum est  
promittunt modici.

I.e., 'small folks only make themselves liable for what [such amounts as] small folks can raise.'

This certainly gives a normal meaning to *promittunt* (e.g. Ep. II. ii. 10). The use of *modicus* would seem to be warranted by Juv. v. 108, *modicis quae mittebantur amicis*. Tacitus has *pecuniae modicus* (Ann. iii. 72). And the general train of the argument would run: 'In all other departments of life people know their limitations; a man knows he cannot exercise a profession in which he is not qualified, or undertake responsibilities beyond his means, or handle the tools of a trade without being skilled in the trade. But poetry is the business where any amateur can can rush in.'

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

University of Glasgow.



## REVIEWS

## STUDIES IN THE ODYSSEY.

*Studies in the Odyssey.* By J. A. K. THOMSON, M.A. Pp. xii + 250. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914. 7s. 6d. net.

RECENT German studies in the saga, coupled with the most unhappy thought of Expurgation, led Prof. Murray to his traditional-book theory of the rise of the Greek epic. His work dealt chiefly with the *Iliad*. The *Odyssey*, which proved less amenable to treatment, is now considered by Mr. Thomson from the same point of view.

The argument is conveniently summarised in the Preface. Odysseus is in origin an 'Eniautos - Daimon' and belongs to Boeotia, which here means Central Greece. He migrated thence with the Minyans to Arcadia, Elis and the Ionian Islands. At Mantinea he was married to the Water-fowl divinity, Penelopé. Boeotian and Arcadian *Odysseys* can be reconstructed. The epos is Ionian, but it was Achæanised at a certain stage. There is a new answer to the question, who were the Achæans? 'Ὀμηρος was a functional name. Homer is a double of Apollo in his capacity of Aoidos.

It is all admittedly very new and very startling, and the scheme bristles with difficulties which require much arguing down. It is of course impossible to review it in detail here, but one item in the proof, the fundamental position of the Boeotian origin of the Eniautos-Daimon—yet another *Wesen* for the πολύτροπος hero!—may be taken as a sample. The hero's grandfather Autolykos is Very Wolf, and Odysseus himself is Wolf, and there was a wolf-god on Parnassus, Autolykos' home, (and no doubt on many another jungle-covered hill in Central Greece in Minyan days), and 'the shadow of Parnassus falls across the Boeotian plain.' Autolykos is a double of Hermes, and Odysseus much the same. Difficulties here are brushed aside. One is that the Parnassus cult was connected with Apollo Lykoreus and not with Hermes. But

that is a trifle. 'The cult was almost certainly in existence before it was taken over by Apollo.' A still graver objection is the philological. It is far from certain that *Ἀὐτόλυκος* = Very-Wolf (Sieck, Vürtheim and Menrad, for instance, give *ipsa lux*), and the odds against the derivation of 'Ὀδυσσεύς from the stem of *λύκος*, a wolf, are very great indeed. But the etymology that suits is selected in another characteristic sentence. 'The stem of 'Ὀλυσσεύς is apparently *luk*, which is the stem of *lukos*, and so Autolykos gives his grandson his own name. Olyseus and Autolykos are therefore apparently only two slightly varying names for the same god or hero named of the wolf.' One has to hack one's way through, as the Germans say, and to disregard philological scraps of paper. But when Mr. Thomson admits, in a later section, that 'in philological matters above all others what is not certain is so very likely to be wrong,' he will not blame us, with so many alternatives to choose from, if we reject this new Wolfian theory altogether. It is supported *inter alia* by reference to Arkesilaos as a family name in the Ithacan genealogical tree, but we should require proof that the name of Odysseus' other grandfather, Arkesios, to whom a new and exaggerated importance is now assigned, is short for Arkesilaos (why not for Arkesidemos or Arkesi—something else?), and that Lykos and the like are really wolfish in signification. Usener thought the latter idea a mere 'juggle of popular etymology,' and, if Fick's judgment that 'Ἀρκείσιος is a *Kosenamen* is by itself final, then his 'Ὀδυσσεύς from 'Ὀδυσσίλαος (the very reverse, by the way, of 'Ἀρκεσίλαος) is final too, and fatal to Mr. Thomson. In asserting, *simplement*, that the later degraded view of Odysseus' character was of the primitive tradition, and that the *Nekyia* is the oldest part of the *Odyssey*, he is only defying authority without helping his case.

So the basis of the scheme is, to say



the least, shaky. For the rest, the question must be, what *evidence* is there that the poem was evolved as a traditional book? The chapters devoted to the enucleation of Boeotian and Arcadian *Odysseys* raise hopes, but are disappointing. They deal with the saga, the *Vorgeschichte* to the epic; for poems and Minyan bards the demonstration is futile. By what right can anyone assume an 'Argo epic' before the beginnings of the *Odyssey*? The language reflects the confusion, so common in recent Homerology, between epos and saga. Now it is 'the poem of Odysseus' that the Minyans take with them on their wanderings, again it is the 'saga of Odysseus' that is modified by the prestige of the Achaeans, and we are finally assured that, in the discussion of the Boeotian kernel, Mr. Thomson is 'merely arguing for the existence of a Boeotian stratum in the legends of Odysseus,' and that is hardly worth quarrelling about. The admission that later developments have coloured and transformed this *Kern* does not of course make the enucleation easier. It would make many enquirers renounce the project in despair of convincing anybody.

The general method displays the weaknesses so often remarked in the works of certain schools in Germany and in this country. The evidential value of obscure religious phenomena or of small hints and happenings in story and legend is unduly exaggerated, and the proof is often one-sided. The saga, always imitative, reproductive and assimilative, and developing different traits in different regions, has left a record so extraordinarily rich, confused and contrarious, that a judiciously eclectic process can make out from it a case for any preconceived idea. If we wish for our argument to prove that Odysseus had an aversion to the horse, the materials are to hand; if we wish to prove his special interest in the quadruped, there is no difficulty. We can use Leukothea's intervention on the hero's behalf as evidence of his Boeotian origin; we can use it to prove quite a different one. If Penelopé has to be proved divine, the scandal that she was the mother of Pan is resusci-

tated, and all the other mothers enumerated by the mythologists are excluded in a staggering sentence—'always, except in one text' (easily disposed of) 'his mother is Penelopé.' If we require to claim for the Argo-saga prior possession of the spring Artakié, we assert borrowing by the *Odyssey*, ignoring considerations which tell against it. Order of development in time and place is just as one wishes to see it. The saga is the happiest of hunting grounds for any one with a theory.

The author's great ability and dexterity in argument are evident on every page, but the method of investigation makes openings for objection equally numerous. He has made a very readable, but very unconvincing, book. The style is clear and terse, but the tone much too dogmatic. Gaps in the reasoning have to be filled in with phrases which mark the hiatus. There is a commendable independence of old critical fads. Mr. Thomson's rejection, for example, of the views of the Hermes of the Hymn and of the same god as *Psychopompos*, which are cherished so widely simply because they are products of German *Kultur*, shows that his Homeric heart is sometimes in the right place. But for his main thesis we want evidence about the *poem*. As was once said of Homeric happy thoughts, *einen Gedanken ausfinden ist Spiel, ihn ausdenken Arbeit*. The 'work' in the present case has still to be done. One example of a great poem that grew from germ to maturity as a traditional book would be worth all the laboured speculations in these *Studies* and in the *Rise of the Greek Epic*. Andrew Lang knew of none such in literary history. A *Shāh-nāma* and a *Kalewala* are worlds away; the Pentateuch and magic herbals are not even in point. To Lang the doctrine of Expurgation, which Mr. Thomson embraces, though not, it may be suggested, with great enthusiasm, was the corner-stone of the new structure, and the only evidential matter worth regarding. He easily discredited it; an examination of the instances adduced can show that it has no basis in fact. But that is another story, to be told elsewhere.

A. SHEWAN.

## MISSON'S MONOGRAPH ON LIBANIUS.

*Recherches sur le Paganisme de Libanios.*

Par J. MISSON, S.J. Large octavo.

Pp. xvi + 160. Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil; or, Paris: Picardet Fils, 1914. Fr. 5.

THE Hellenists, who in the fourth Christian century were suddenly confronted with the Emperor Julian's restoration of the pagan cults, had to decide each for himself how far he would follow the lead of that uncompromising fanatic. Theurgists, like Maximus, attached themselves to his person, and were sure of support; a few philosophers, like Themistius, held aloof, whether from caution or intellectual arrogance; and Julian was, of course, at once surrounded by a crowd of flatterers whose zeal was of all shades of sincerity. But there was another group of men who were deeply interested in his religious revival, though they may not have sympathised with all his beliefs or methods. These were the educated conservative pagans who had preserved in their families the traditional worship of the gods. They had not been persecuted by Constantine and Constantius, partly because they were discreet, partly because they were useful for writing panegyrics, and partly because to attack them would not have been a popular move. Such a man was Libanius, the famous rhetorician of Antioch, who possessed the greatest influence in his native city, solely on account of his persuasive eloquence and personal charm. Long after the collapse of Julian's revival he maintained his position and his school, and though he had to suffer many petty annoyances from which Julian would have protected him, he still wrote the imperial panegyrics that no Emperor could do without, adjusted strikes, and taught Greek letters to his Syrian, Armenian, Thracian, and Arab pupils. If he complains it is mainly because, like all Greek professors, he had to see practical studies such as Roman law gradually ousting the study of Greek literature, which meant that the literary declamation and the school of rhetoric would soon cease to exist.

To define the religious convictions of such a man is not easy. M. Misson has carefully tabulated his references to *ὁ θεός* and *οἱ θεοί*, to the solar deities, to prayer, the Mysteries, and so forth. From these it appears that Libanius did not lean to monotheism, and that he means precisely the same thing, whether he refers to the gods in the singular or the plural; that in all the events, good and bad of his own career, he saw the intervention of *Τύχη*, the all-pervading, and though he does not assign to her creative or demiurgic powers, she possesses all the other attributes of the most powerful gods. Though he was free from the grosser superstitions and belief in prodigies that swayed Julian, he had a blind belief in dreams. The poets are for him inspired authors, and he did not trouble himself with physical interpretations of the myths as Julian did. Nor did he, like Julian, make Helios-Mithras the supreme god, though there are numerous invocations to Helios in his speeches. For the evidence of his genuine piety M. Misson relies mainly on the brief invocations to the gods that escape from him in the speeches and letters—if, indeed, anything can be said to escape from so accomplished a rhetorician. But in defining the religion of a literary man who was the slave of the conventions of rhetoric it is easier to say what he was not, and on this head M. Misson might have said more with advantage. Libanius was not a missionary eager to make converts, nor a Neo-Platonic philosopher, a fact which saved him from the temptation to theurgy which dogged the Neo-Platonists of his day. Above all he betrays no sympathy with the impassioned revivalism fostered by Julian. In fact, between his religious faith and Julian's we see all the contrasts that we should expect to find between the convert who cannot rest till he has converted everybody else, and the man who has inherited his religion from his ancestors. Julian does not seem to have been dissatisfied with Libanius on the score of enthusiasm. He knew that the schools of rhetoric

were the real stronghold of paganism, and that men like Libanius, who believed that Greek culture and rhetoric must perish if the Christians should triumph, were his most sincere supporters. Libanius always took for granted that the Christians were barbarians, whose religion shut them out from Hellenic philosophy and culture. This was not true, as was shown by their dismay when Julian issued his edict forbidding the teaching of classical literature by the Christians. The latter, in fact, had never attempted to overthrow the educational tradition, or to train their pupils by means of the Scriptures. They returned to the classics with renewed ardour, when the Christian Valentinian rescinded the edict. Another striking difference between Julian and Libanius is that the latter shows no interest in Julian's earnest attempt to persuade the Hellenists, and especially the priests, that to regain their hold on the common people they must emulate the works of charity and the pure morals of the best Christians. In the old-fashioned sense of the word he was more orthodox than Julian, more

conservative, and he would not have welcomed Jehovah to the company of the gods as Julian hastened to do. He was an intellectual aristocrat, who took no more trouble to understand Christianity than an intellectual to-day would take to understand a new religion. The composition of a declamation embroidered with the proper commonplaces from Greek literature, and the applause of his audience, were more to him than all Julian's moral exhortations and sacrifices to the gods. No doubt he would have preferred, like Ammianus, that his Emperor should be *sacrorum legitimus observator*.

M. Misson's monograph, and the dissertations on Libanius that are beginning to appear, are signs of the renewed interest in his works due to Foerster's edition, which has made Libanius accessible to the student. During the whole nineteenth century he had been unread and practically buried in Reiske's eighteenth-century edition.

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT.

*Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.*

#### THE GREEK DIMINUTIVE SUFFIX -ισκο- -ισκη-.

*The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ισκο- -ισκη-.*

By WALTER PETERSEN. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press. 1913.

THE first few pages of this exhaustive investigation deal with the distribution of the suffix -ισκο- in the different Indo-Germanic languages. Whereas it is common in Greek, in Latin there are only three examples. The suffix may be analysed into -is-, weak grade of the comparative suffix -jes- -jos, with the common -ko- suffix as the second element. -ισκο- might originally be used to form both adjectives and nouns; in Greek it has become specialised as a nominal suffix. It is found in all periods of the Greek language, though it is entirely absent from Aeolic (and probably on this account from Homer also). The accent falls regularly on the first

syllable of the suffix, though this has a short *i*; the author ascribes this as being due to the influence of the feminine (-ισκη) and cases of the masculine which end in a long vowel or diphthong. The gender of derivatives in -ισκο- is the same as that of their primitives. We are next introduced to the different meanings of the suffix, (a) similarity or approximate identity, (b) deteriorative, (c) diminutive, (d) hypocoristic, (e) proper names. Each of these classes is again subdivided into 'congeneric groups.' On the whole this subdivision has been well done, though occasionally it would appear to be somewhat fanciful, see especially § 62 and §§ 102, 103. Before dealing with the proper names, the author sums up as follows: 'Apparent cases of all meanings except diminutive uses and the designation of similarity are later than the Classical period, and

never were consciously attributed to the suffix. Words which seem to show these meanings are all due to congeneric attraction or to the substitution of *-ισκο-* for *-ιον* because of the general feeling of equivalence of the two suffixes.

The chapter on the proper names is particularly interesting and offers scope for some criticism. We think § 105 should have been placed earlier and considerably extended. We feel convinced that the proper name *Ἀνδρίσκος* is to be regarded as a short-name ('Kosename') from *Ἀνδροκράτης*, etc., and is not a diminutive of *ἀνήρ*, meaning 'manikin.' The same applies to *Μενίσκος* from *Μενέξενος*, etc., not from *Μένων*, *Ποδίσκος* from *Ποδάρεκς*, etc., not from *Ποδῆς*. We think this principle should have been applied much more widely than it has been. We should not have had *Λυκίσκος* first explained as derived from *λύκος* with an idea of similarity to the primitive, and only five pages later discover the right (as we believe) explanation—namely, that it is a short-name from a compound like *Λυκοῦργος*; similarly with *Μηνίσκος* (not 'like the moon,' but from *Μηνόδοτος*, etc.), *Πατρίσκος* (not 'little father,' but from *Πατροκλῆς*, etc.). We do not believe that *Μενίσκος* on the Thessalian inscription quoted (p. 194) meant 'son of *Μένων*' or 'little *Μένων*,' but think that

the father's name, though doubtless influencing the choice of the son's, was like the son's originally a short-name from *Μενέλαος*, etc., as the author suggests (p. 198). Our complaint is that the author has not applied this principle much more widely. We would strongly recommend every reader to study § 105 before turning to the subdivisions of proper names on the preceding pages.

This slight blemish, however, does not impair the value of the work as a whole. It is a most thorough and useful investigation, and one that must have demanded a great deal of patience and hard labour to carry out. No future Greek Grammar will be complete, that does not recognise the results of Mr. Petersen's research. There is a complete index of words in *-ισκο-* *-ισκη-*.

The following misprints have been noticed: p. 156, l. 25, *wich* for *which*; p. 157, l. 12, *scarccely* for *scarcely*; p. 159 (heading), *-ισχο* for *-ισκο-*; p. 160, l. 20, *as for an*; p. 164, note 1, l. 2, *quotes* for *quoted*; p. 175, l. 4, *do* for *to*; p. 178, l. 9, *δφαχμαί* for *δραχμαί*; p. 189, l. 17, *do* for *to*; p. 193, l. 28, *Tiberias* for *Tiberius*. On p. 197, l. 3, we read 'Metapontinan.' Surely this is an unnecessary innovation for the usual 'Metapontine'!

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

*The University, Manchester*

## STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION.

*Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Labial Terminations III. and IV.* By E. H. STURTEVANT. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1913. Published in the United Kingdom by the Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, as agents for the University of Chicago Press.

*Labial Terminations III. and IV.* are a continuation of two earlier studies on the same subject. I. (1910) contained a discussion of words formed by means of a *β*-suffix, II. (1911) those with a *φ*-suffix. In the present numbers we have in III. words in *-πη* or *-πᾶ* (also *-πᾶ*)—in *-πης*

or *-πᾶς*, gen. *-που*—in *-πος* and *-πον*, gen. *-που*, and in IV. words in *-ψ*. Finally we have *Additions and Corrections to Labial Terminations I.-IV.*

In III. Mr. Sturtevant commences with a discussion of words of the *ἀλλοδαπός* and *ποδαπός* type, and mentions a variety of explanations, including a new one by Buck, who would divide the words *ἀλλο-δαπός*, etc., and considers them originally possessive compounds, accented *\*ἀλλο-δαπος*, etc. *\*Δαπος* he would connect with *δάπτω*, *δαπάνη*, *daps*, as derived from a simpler root *da*, *dē*, meaning 'divide.' *-δαπος* would mean 'division, district, region,' and *ἀλλοδαπός* be equivalent to *ἀλλόδημος*, *ἀλλόφυλος*.



Mr. Sturtevant then deals fully with words in -*οψ*, -*ωψ*, -*οπος*, -*ωπος*, formed from the root *οπ*- 'see.' He shows that in some (*εὐρύοπα*, *τηλωπός*, etc.), the root still has a verbal force, 'seeing' or 'seen'; in this group he places *πρόσωπον* and *μέτωπον*, though it is not quite easy to discover the exact meaning of the words in this connection. Then we pass to the group containing the meaning 'eye' in the second member. From this we get the meaning 'face,' which 'is often generalised into "appearance," as in *οἶνοπι πόντω*, etc.' We are shown that -*οψ* is a favourite form in Homer, whereas -*ωπος* is rare; in later Greek the reverse is the case. -*οψ* and -*ωψ* became mere suffixes even in prehistoric times and lost the original force of the root; this suffix was especially common in the names of animals (*κέρκωψ*, *κώνωψ*, *σκάλοψ*, etc.). *πηνελόπη* is apparently derived from *πηνέλοψ*, a kind of duck. A number of names of diseases are also formed with the same suffix. We cannot, however, agree with Mr. Sturtevant, when he stigmatises the translations of *βοῶπις* 'ox-eyed' and *γλαυκῶπις* 'owl-eyed' as 'absurd.' He would recognise a mere meaningless suffix -*ωπις* (fem. of -*ωψ*) in both words, and translate 'to whom the ox (owl) is sacred.' But why are a number of women called *βοῶπις* in Homer? We do not think Mr. Sturtevant has surmounted this difficulty satisfactorily. In later compounds in -*ώψ* and -*ωπός* the meaning 'having the appearance of'

was first weakened to 'like,' and then faded away altogether, so that *ἀγριωπὸν ὄμμα* (Eur.) is the same as *ἀγριον ὄμμα*, *σκυθρωπός* means no more than *σκυθρός*, *ἀντωπός* is the mere equivalent of *ἀντίος*, *Ἀισωπος* of *ἄισιος* 'auspicious,' etc. When this process was taking place, we find new compounds in -*πρόσωπος* 'face' and -*οφθαλμός* 'eye' being formed, where the full force of the second element of the compound is required. Ethnica, place-names, and personal names are discussed, and finally a few other words in -*πη*, -*πος* (compounds of *ἵππος*, *ποδ*-, etc.). An important and just observation is that 'in the majority of those words which make up our lists *π* is obviously a part of the root,' and 'there is no sufficient evidence of an Indo-European suffix -*po*- or -*gmo*-, such as would yield Greek -*πο*-.' Sixteen pages of text are followed by twenty-eight of word-lists.

In IV. Mr. Sturtevant practically confines himself to a discussion of loan-words and those of uncertain etymology. Seven pages of text are followed by five of word-lists. The volume closes with three pages of *Additions and Corrections*.

A great deal of interesting matter has been gathered together in these *Studies*. A welcome feature are the copious references to other writings on the same subject. The word-lists are drawn up in a very convenient way for reference.

G. E. K. BRAUNHOLTZ.

*The University, Manchester.*

## THE TEACHING OF LATIN.

*Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils.*

By J. BEZARD. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 424.

Paris: Libraire Vuibert, 1914. 3.50 francs.

WE fear that far too many classical scholars, deeply immersed in their University work or in some other sphere of more or less advanced research, give never a thought to the slow and patient labours of their humbler brethren who are daily giving of their best in the schools of the country in

order to train up a future generation that shall be capable and worthy of carrying on the traditions of classical scholarship. They are far too content to take the material that is sent up to them from the schools for granted; occasionally they may emit a surly grunt at the poorness of the quality; rarely do they bestow a thought upon the process by which it has been manufactured. In this country the reforms associated with the term 'Direct Method' have received remarkably small notice—

not to speak of encouragement—from the higher branches of the teaching profession. But it does really behove us to take a little more intelligent interest in the classical work of our schools. The publication of the present volume indicates, we trust, a somewhat better attitude on the part of those interested in the classics in France to the work of French schoolmasters.

As an exposition of a reformed standpoint of teaching this book appears to us to be far behind the position which is held in this country by supporters of the Direct Method. M. Bezard insists very strongly and—as it seems to us—equally rightly upon the necessity of a very strict preliminary training in formal grammar before the pupil is allowed to enter upon the study of Latin at all. Thus a sure foundation is laid before the new language is approached, and each pupil has to build upon that foundation for himself by making his own *instruments de travail* as they are called. These consist in the earliest period of note-books for vocabulary, accidence, and conjugation schemes, etc. Later on a note-book of idioms—not a mere tourist's phrase-book, but a means of logical and scientific comparison of the difference between the idioms of the two languages—is started, and these note-books are kept on throughout the School work as essential means of tackling any text. All this is excellent, as is also the distinction between *les exercices de contrôle* and *les exercices d'acquisition*; the superstition of the paramount importance of written work is exposed, and the position maintained that it is oral work which really teaches while written work is but a test of knowledge acquired. Nothing could be better than the humorous description of the state of mind of the poor bewildered boy, slave to his dictionary, who hunts

about page after page in that dictionary for one or other of the unknown words he finds in the text before him, until he quite forgets what it is that he was looking for!

So far so good; what is more surprising is to find the old *construe* with its attendant parsing and analysis taken for granted throughout as the only mode of procedure. Thus we find even boys *en première* (our sixth form, we presume) engaged in picking out the subject and indirect object of a sentence in Livy. If M. Bezard comes some day to attack this traditional method of work we feel that he will accomplish something of real value for improving the methods of teaching in his country. He has already gone a good way—a boy is not asked to write until he is capable, with care, of writing correctly (the ideal of *zéro faute* is ever laid before him), the text is prepared in class rather than at home; boys take the part of master and ask their fellows questions upon the text before them. But they are never free from this eternal analysis and parsing; transcripts of actual lessons are given, and we find that it takes an hour and forty-five minutes to extract the meat out of some twenty-five lines of Livy. We can do better than this as regards the *language* teaching by our reformed methods here in England, but perhaps we may learn something from this book about the teaching of *literature*. This is a difficult subject and success depends almost entirely upon the personality of the teacher, but we recommend every classical schoolmaster to read the appreciations of Virgil, written by M. Bezard's pupils, and given here in full, and then to ask himself whether he has led his own pupils to a like appreciation.

R. B. APPLETON.

*Perse School, Cambridge.*

## A NEW EDITION OF FIRMICUS.

*Iulii Materni Firmici Matheseos Libri VIII.*, ediderunt W. Kroll, F. Skutsch, K. Ziegler; *Fasciculus II.* Pp. lxxvii + 558. Teubner, 1913. M. 12.

IF the ghosts of third-rate writers are in any degree moved by the devotion of a distant posterity, Iulius Firmicus Maternus Iunior Siculus V.C. must be accounted happy: he has certainly received at the hand of Messrs. Kroll, Skutsch, and Ziegler double for any neglect he may have suffered in the past. The *Mathesis* was written not long before the death of Constantine (†337). (It is dated by comparing the reference to that emperor at 1. 10. 13, with the allusion to the solar eclipse of 334 at 1. 4. 10 and with the mention of the praefecture of Rufius Albinus at 2. 29. 10). About ten years later Firmicus published, for the admonition of Constantine's sons, the treatise *De Errore Profanarum Religionum*. The *Mathesis* is the work of a pagan astrologer, and informed throughout by a mild and Christian spirit. The *De Errore* is the work of a Christian apologist, full of fanaticism and all uncharitableness. This spiritual paradox (to which, one would have thought, even quite modern times furnish numerous analogues) led Bursian and others to propound the view that the two books were the work of different authors—it was even gravely suggested that the pagan and the Christian, having but one name between them, were perhaps first cousins. This sceptical view has now been rendered untenable by the researches of F. Moore, F. Boll, A. Mueller, and our three editors. The Chozizontes will no more trouble us.

Between the fourth and the twelfth centuries there seems to be no reference to Firmicus in any writer. About the beginning of the twelfth century, Honorius the Solitary, of Autun, mentions him, together with Ptolemy, as a supreme authority in judicial astrology. A little later occur two mentions of him in the works of

William of Malmesbury.<sup>1</sup> One of these carries us back to the eleventh century, instructing us that Girard, Archbishop of York, 'among other sins read Firmicus.' It was said that under his pillow, when he died by a sudden death, was found concealed a copy of the *Mathesis*. The wicked Archbishop seems to have done his best to propagate the study of his favourite author. One of his pupils was the nameless author of a work upon English Law entitled *Quadripartitus* (414), and every page of the *Quadripartitus* bears witness to a close imitation of the diction of Firmicus. Another Englishman of the twelfth century who refers to Firmicus is Daniel of Morley (before 1200). Girard, Archbishop of York, acquired his learning in Normandy. Kroll and Ziegler suppose, therefore, that Firmicus migrated with Girard from France to England. But the Library of York was rich in all varieties of ancient literature; and it is perhaps possible that it was in York itself that Girard first made acquaintance with Firmicus. It is true that our best MSS. of Firmicus comes from France; but they seem to be not older in any case than Girard, and prior to Girard there is no continental reference to Firmicus.

Kroll and Ziegler enumerate no less than 43 MSS. of the *Mathesis*—there is only one of the *De Errore*. Three of these 43 are of outstanding merit, *M.P.R.*, all of saec. XI. There are also two thirteenth-century codd. of the same stock, which, though a good deal 'corrected,' are of value. None of these five, however, extend beyond c. 22 of Book IV. We are thrown back, therefore, for the last half of the work on 'late and inferior MSS.; and it is here that the extended researches of the new editors deserve especial commendation. It must be remembered that they owe nothing to previous editors. Firmicus has hitherto

<sup>1</sup> Whom I find referred to in a German dictionary as 'William Sommerset und Wilton.'

been commonly read in the edition of Pruckner; and this, like all other texts, is little more than a reproduction of the Aldine. Particular mention should be made of the elaborate Index Verborum with which Ziegler has furnished the work of himself and his colleagues. This is of great value to the student of astrology, and also to the student of the Latin of this period generally. The *De Errore* is furnished with a similar Index, which should be of service, I imagine, to students of the Latin texts of the Bible—Firmicus' Biblical quotations are very numerous.

The new interest in Firmicus is due largely to the increased vogue of Manilius. (Firmicus nowhere mentions Manilius: but in Books IV. and VIII. he has pillaged him shamelessly.) It

is due also to the wider study of astrological literature as a whole—a study greatly promoted by the Catalogues of Boll and Cumont. Firmicus is also interesting to the student of prose-rhythm. Ziegler in Vol. I. has a great deal of interesting matter on the subject of Firmicus' *clausulae*.

This is yet another work bearing the name of Franz Skutsch, which that distinguished scholar was destined to leave uncompleted. These posthumous issues are a notable witness to the fullness and variety of Skutsch's labours, and serve to remind us of the vast loss which Latin scholarship has sustained in his untimely death.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

## SHORT NOTICES

*A Selection of Latin Verse*, ed. by the Instructors in Latin in Williams College (published by H. Milford on behalf of the Yale University Press, 3s. 6d. net), is an excellent anthology 'representative of the best Latin poetry of all periods,' well chosen, clearly printed and nicely bound. 'The editors plan to publish later brief explanatory notes.' This book is very similar in size and character to Mr. Cook's volume in the Golden Treasury series. It is suitable for occasional reading in a fifth or sixth form, and well worth keeping *animi causa* when schooldays are over.

Σ.

*Sophocles in English Verse*. Part II: *Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes*. By ARTHUR S. WAY, D. Lit. Crown 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 276. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 3s. 6d.

It is difficult for the same man to translate successfully Sophocles and Euripides, and more than once we seem to discern the translator of Euripides in this volume. The impassioned repetitions of Electra's speech, 804, etc., are alien from the bitter de-

liberateness of Sophocles' heroine, and we miss again and again in the translation that sense of 'effortless mastery,' which has been attributed to Sophocles. A poet who rejoiced in the dexterous use of simple words wrested from their ordinary meaning does not supply the best field for a translator who loves an exotic vocabulary, and who represents such words as *ἄφοβος* and *τάλας* in the original by 'mistrustless' and 'unbending-souled,' and who can translate *δύστηνος τροφός* by 'woeful fostress.' It would take Alexandria rather than Athens to have supplied the original of such translations as:

'I spied the army-chief,  
Agamemnon, posting hither for our bane.  
I trow he will unrein a froward tongue.'

or—

'When life runs smooth, then most behoves  
to watch  
Life, lest unwarred in ruin thou be whelmed.'

Here Sophocles, rather than Dr. Way, 'runs smooth.'

The translation of these four plays possesses the distinctive merits of Dr. Way's work—fidelity to the original in at any rate the iambic parts, sound judgment in interpretation of passages



where the meaning is doubtful, spirit and dash in translating the choruses, though here he departs very far from his author and errs on the side of excessive amplitude. We must admire the variety of metres employed in translating the lyrics, though we may question the suitability of some of them. The rhythm of the half chorus in *Ajax* 865 is too suggestive of a Nursery Rhyme, and we want a setting by Sir A. Sullivan to the Chorus in the *Philoctetes* (676, etc.). Other criticisms have to be made: there are too many inharmonious lines and phrases, such as 'Shamed were I, dames, if I should seem to you.' 'Know, nought I wot,' 'Grant that I, aye living,' 'mares' ears.' However continuous the flow of blank verse may be, it is not well that a line detached from its context should suggest poetry so little as 'Is, and of me: yet hear what boon of thee.' The rhymes sometimes are too reminiscent of *Hymns Ancient and Modern*—e.g., Vision . . . Nysian; levin . . . heaven; please . . . cease; yearning . . . turning. It could be wished that Dr. Way's work were always up to the level of his best, but side by side we find excellent, strong lines, and some which are prosaic or mannered. We may quote, for instance, *Ajax* 758-761:

'For lives grown proud, and profitless to Heaven,  
Fall by stern visitation of the gods'—  
So spake the seer—'yea, whoso, mortal-born  
By nature, thinks not mortal-lowly thoughts.'

and *Phil.* 104-105:

*Neop.* How? Hath he aweless might so terrible?  
*Od.* Unerring shafts he hath: death rides on them.

The first has a sudden *diminuendo*; the second a sudden *crescendo* of worth.

A. S. OWEN.

*Lucian.* Vol. I. Translated by A. M. HARMON. 12mo. Pp. xii + 471. London: Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library), 1913. Price 5s.

MR. A. M. HARMON has produced in the Loeb Classics the first instalment

of a translation of Lucian; his first volume contains fifteen treatises or dialogues, including some like the *Judicium Vocalium* of rather doubtful paternity. It is a very readable translation, best when rendering descriptive passages, good in the narrative, sometimes (but not often) less successful in the dialogue, where the combination of solemn and colloquial language produces a more stilted effect in the English than in the Greek. Modern equivalent phrases are happily introduced, but the work is not made to teem with neologisms; the puns are sometimes courageously attempted (might Berkeley be suggested for Barson on p. 167, as the name of a real philosopher?). The passages rendered from the dramatists on pp. 241, 439 and 463 suggest that Mr. Harmon is less at home in translating verse. A few misprints and errors may be noted. On p. 115 a sentence in the translation has gone wrong: 'because' or some such word has been omitted; on p. 124 *ὑπερλότερον*, and on p. 195 'plan' for 'place' may be noted as misprints. On p. 292 *ὁμοφάγον* need not mean 'cannibals': it is not implied that they ate one another; on p. 328 to translate *μυσαττόμενος τὴν κναμοφαγίαν* by 'he detested beans' hardly does justice to the conscientious motives of the abstainer; on p. 401 'Palamedes of Nauplia' is a mistranslation of *Παλαμήδης ὁ Ναυπλίου*, and on p. 446 *παροινούντες* implies a more violent result of intoxication than is suggested by 'maudlin.' A few short notes supply necessary information on the allusions; one on Philoxenus on p. 377 might be added.

A. S. OWEN.

*Papyri Iandanae.* 8vo. Fasc. I., by E. Schaefer, pp. 1-34, 4 plates. Fasc. II., by L. Eisner, pp. 35-74, 3 plates. Fasc. III., by L. Spohr, pp. 75-124, 4 plates. Fasc. IV., by G. Spiess, pp. 125-160, 3 plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912-14.

THE *Papyri Iandanae* are a small collection so named from the printers and publishers, Messrs. K. R. and J. F. Ianda, to whose liberality it owes its

foundation. For the present it is in the keeping of Prof. Kalbfleisch, now of Giessen, and is being edited by some of his pupils, under his supervision. Of the four slender parts which have so far appeared, the first consists of literary fragments, the second of letters, and the other two of miscellaneous documents. It can hardly be said that any of these papyri, either literary or documentary, are of outstanding merit. The former section comprises a scrap of *Iliad* Δ; some early but very fragmentary scholia on Θ; short astrological and grammatical pieces; another still slighter, of doubtful content; a Christian amulet, including the Lord's Prayer; and a second unidentified Christian fragment. Of the private letters the most noteworthy is No. 9, referring to an action at law which the archidicastes had been delegated by the praefect to decide. The other papyri, many of which are very imperfectly preserved, are divided fairly equally between the Roman and Byzantine periods; they belong for the most part to familiar types, but are not without small points of interest. An instance of compulsory cultivation of domain land in the reign of Trajan is apparently to be recognised in No. 27. An imperial rescript in Latin, showing that in the second century the class of minor officials called *chiristae* formed a corporation, and were subject to a property qualification, is unfortunately much mutilated. The editing is careful and competent, though, as Wilcken's notes in *Archiv* vi., pp. 292 *sqq.*, indicate, the decipherments are not incapable of improvement.

A. S. H.

*An Elementary Latin Grammar*, by E. E. Bryant and E. D. C. Lake (Clarendon Press, 1s. 6d.), gives the most important parts of the accidence clearly printed and divided into four stages by the use of different type and lines down the side of the page. The book seems suitable only for very young beginners; even for them we prefer a book which tells more about the language. There is no difficulty in distinguishing the things to be learned by heart from the

explanatory matter which is to be referred to when occasion arises. The gender rhymes are very poor; they don't scan and they don't include some important words, e.g. *arbor*; on the other hand *praedo* and *consul* surely need not be given. We hope the advice to decline *ullus* and *solus* like *alius* will not be followed too strictly.

*An Elementary Latin Grammar*, by A. Sloman (170 pp., Cambridge University Press, 2s. 6d.), is meant for students from the senior forms of Preparatory Schools up to the standard of Matriculation. There are a few new features, but none that call for special notice. There is a tendency to make these books too short and to leave out much that is important and interesting. For instance, one wants a list of irregular verbs classified according to formation; here we have only an alphabetical list. It is stated (p. 75) that no Imperative of *edo* occurs in Classical. This is not true; *es* occurs in Plautus (e.g. *Mil.* 677) and Ovid, *Ars am.* III. 758. On the other hand we doubt if there is evidence till quite late Latin for the form *ede* given in an example on p. 119. On p. 92 it is stated that the genitives *magni*, *parvi*, etc., are used with verbs of buying and selling (as well as with verbs of valuing); this is true only of *pluris*, *minoris*, *tanti*, *quantum*. Cicero, for instance, has (*Verr.* 3. 40 and 43), *magno vendidi*, *pluris vendidisti*, *minoris vendidit*, and *quam plurimo venderet*.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

*Kleinasiatisch-etruskische Namengleichungen*. Von GUSTAV HERBIG (Sitzungsberichte der königl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1914, 2 Abhandlung). München: Verlag der königl. Bayer. Akademie, 1914. pp. 39.

THE progress toward the solution of the Etruscan problem is steady, but very, very slow. If, indeed, wealth could be attracted to the search, and excavations could be carried on in the borderland of the Etruscan and Latin

districts, a bilingual inscription might be unearthed which (like the Rosetta stone) would give us in a moment the key to the problem. As it is, we have to wait until the slow accumulation of sifted fact and the deliberate calculation of this and that and the other probability lead us inch by inch into the region of certainty. Of course the 'crank' with his ready-made solution of the mystery appears from time to time; but if we resolutely keep silent about the 'crank' and his theories and think of him in Martial's fashion—'Nam te cur aliquis sciat fuisse?'—he will not much hinder progress.

Prof. Herbig, the editor of the *Corpus of Etruscan Inscriptions*, is the sanest and safest of guides. When he writes on the subject, his readers are usually inclined to go a good deal further than the writer himself. He gives us here material for comparing the names (of persons and places) in the Etruscan language and in the pre-Greek languages of Asia Minor. He warns us of the necessity of caution and takes as his motto, 'Incendo per ignes.' But we cannot help feeling that a strong case has been made out in support of the 'Father of Truth,' old Herodotus (I. 94), who found the home of the Etruscans in Lydia.

W. M. LINDSAY.

---

*Das Leben des Philosophen Isidoros von Damaskios aus Damaskos.* Wiedergebottelt, ubersetzt und erklart von RUDOLF ASMUS. Pp. xvi + 224. Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1911.

HERR ASMUS is already known to students of later Hellenism by his translation of the writings of the Emperor Julian, as well as by contributions to various periodicals on subjects connected with the history of Neo-

platonism. In this volume he gives us a translation, with explanatory comments, of a revised Greek text, without the text itself. The importance of the work lies in the way that the existing fragmentary material is pieced together, and welded into one tolerably complete and consecutive whole. That material is mainly derived from Photios, who supplies 312 paragraphs, supplemented by some Glosses of Suidas. The translator indicates his own expository additions to the text and connecting links by the use of brackets and italics, in a clear and concise way; and a series of three Indexes, of Names, Topics, and References, serve to complete a work which should prove very useful to students of the history of thought in the fifth and sixth centuries.

R. G. B.

---

*Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt.* Von Professor AUGUST HEISENBERG. (Beck. 40 pp. M. 0.80.)

THE interest of this little book for classical scholars lies in the connection which the author traces between the renaissance of interest in classical studies in Winckelmann's time and the help rendered to the cause of Greek independence in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. Under Ludwig I. of Bavaria large sums of money were collected; and poets and professors alike endeavoured to pay back to the Greece of their day some part of what they owed to the Greece of old. The brochure is a piece of impassioned pleading for the support of Greek independence; the maintenance of the spirit of patriotism in the people through centuries of Turkish oppression and of their language ('vor allem auch die Sprache') is largely due, Professor Heisenberg holds, to the influence of the Greek Church.

M. P.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I DESIRE to chronicle in these pages the death in battle, in East Prussia, of my friend and collaborator, Hans Wegehaupt. Those who are interested in the text of Plutarch will be acquainted with the important studies he has published on the *Moralia*. He did not, unhappily, survive to edit those treatises, which he had undertaken in the new Teubner edition, but this edition (he was helping me with the proofs of Vol. I. when the war broke out) will owe more than I can say to his industry and insight. It was he, chiefly, who undertook the task of examining and estimating the very numerous MSS. of the *Moralia*, and made it

possible for us to proceed with confidence to the task of editing. It is very sad that he should not have been spared to gather himself the fruit of his labour. The most difficult of the tasks he undertook was the decyphering of the Florence palimpsest, in which Diogenes has been written over a *Moralia* MS. (the earliest we possess). He persevered in this at the risk of permanent injury to his eyes. The conclusions he reached about the relationship of the MSS. in general are perfectly certain, and we owe it chiefly to him that we can reject with confidence all that is worthless, and build a text on a sure foundation.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* \* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

*American Journal of Philology*. Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXV. 3, Whole No. 139. Pp. 245-378. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1914.

*Buffet* (E. P.) *The Layman Revato: A Story of a Restless Mind in Buddhist India at the Time of Greek Influence*. 12" x 9". Pp. vi+106. New York: McMurtrie, 1914. Cloth, \$2.

*Classical Association of Scotland*. Proceedings, 1913-14. 8" x 6½". Pp. vi+128. Edinburgh: Pillans and Wilson, 1914. Cloth.

*Classical Philology: A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity*. Vol. IX., No. 4. October, 1914. 9½" x 6½". Pp. vi+345-472. University of Chicago Press.

*Davis* (G. M. N.) *The Asiatic Dionysos*. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xii+276. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

*Dean* (L. R.) *Index to Facsimiles in the Palaeographical Society Publications*. 9½" x 6¾". Pp. 55. Princeton, N.J.: The University Library, 1914. Paper boards, \$1 net.

*Harcum* (C. G.) *Roman Cooks* (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9" x 6". Pp. 88. Baltimore: Furst Company, 1914.

*Havet* (L.) *Notes Critiques sur le texte de Festus*. 10" x 6½". Pp. 58. Paris: H. Champion, 1914. Fr. 2.50.

*Hermathena*. No. XL. 9" x 5¾". Pp. xvi+174. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1914. 4s.

*Hodges* (C. E.) *A Latin Notebook*. 8½" x 6¾". Pp. viii+128. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Paper boards, 2s.

*Homer* (Iliad) Translated into English by A. Lang, W. Leaf, and E. Myers. Revised edition. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii+508. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 3s. 6d.

*Jatta* (M.) *Tombe Canosine del Museo Provinciale di Bari*. 10" x 6½". Pp. 90-126, with 3 coloured plates and 17 illustrations in text. Rome: Von Loescher and Co., 1914.

*Livy* (Book III.) By P. T. Jones. 7½" x 5". Pp. 282. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d; without vocabulary, 2s. 6d.

*Loeb Classical Library*. Caesar: *The Civil Wars* (A. G. Peskett), pp. v+370. Ovid: *Heroides and Amores* (G. S. Showerman), pp. viii+524. Procopius (H. B. Dewing), Vol. I., pp. xvi+584. Xenophon: *Cyropaedia* (W. Miller), Vol. II., pp. vi+478. Dio's Roman History, Vol. III., pp. viii+519. Plutarch's Lives (B. Perrin), Vol. I., pp. xix+582; Vol. II., pp. x+631. 6½" x 4¼". London: W. Heinemann, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net each.

*Paelow* (L. J.) *The Battle of the Seven Arts: A French Poem by Henri d'Andeli, trouvère of the thirteenth century*. Edited and translated by L. J. P. *Memoirs of the University of California: History*, Vol. I., No. 1. 13½" x 10". Pp. 63, 10 plates. Berkeley, 1914.

*Plato*. *The Apology of Socrates*. Edited by A. M. Adam. (Elementary Classics.) 6¾" x 4¾". Pp. xx+109. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

*Weeks* (K.) *Science, Sentiments, and Senses*. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii+232. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.



to  
ne  
elf  
of  
nt  
es  
ne  
at  
ne  
p  
n,  
ct  
d

r

d

y  
d  
:

-

n

.

d

e

y

e

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.